



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08175191 3

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

CONDUCTED BY
EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D.

Late Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary at Andover.

VOLUME FOURTH.
Nos. XIII—XVI.

ANDOVER:
GOULD AND NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS AND PRINTERS.

NEW YORK:
LEAVITT, LORD AND CO. 182 BROADWAY.
1834.

1847 von
1847
1847

ADVERTISEMENT.

With the present volume, the labours of the undersigned as Editor of the Biblical Repository, close. As its Founder and Conductor, he has now for four years devoted his best time and talents to the work ; and has been cheered in his progress by the high approbation of eminent christian scholars and divines in this and foreign lands. But this approbation has been won, and the work hitherto sustained, at an expense of time and labour, for which nothing in the shape of adequate remuneration has been received by the Editor, — farther than the consciousness of not having laboured in vain. Under these circumstances, and bowed down with broken health, he feels it to be a duty which he owes to himself, to his family, and perhaps to the churches, to withdraw from the station which he has hitherto occupied as the conductor of a public Journal.

In thus retiring from this more public station, it is by no means the subscriber's intention to abandon the field of labour in which it has so long been the business and solace of

his life to hold a humble place. But whether his days shall be prolonged for the completion of other works illustrative of the Bible, or whether his race of life be soon to close, he would ever say, **THY WILL, O GOD, BE DONE !**

E. ROBINSON.

Boston, Oct. 1, 1834.

NOT FOR
SALE
BY

CONTENTS OF VOL. IV.

NO. XIII.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. ON THE CATECHETICAL SCHOOL, OR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT ALEXANDRIA IN EGYPT. By Prof. Emerson	1	CRUCIFIXION. By J. H. Rauch. Translated by the Editor	108
Preliminary Remarks	1	ART. V. OUTLINES OF A COURSE OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS. Translated from the German by the Editor	127
Alexandrian School	10	Introduction	127
Athenagoras	24	Theological Encyclopedia	129
Pantaenus	27	" Methodology	134
Clement	30	ART. VI. PAUL AS THE APOSTLE OF THE HEATHEN. HIS EDUCATION AND CALL. From Neander's Hist. of the Apostolic Age. Translated by the Editor	138
Origen	33	ART. VII. PHILOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By the Editor	154
Heracles	48	ART. VIII. ON THE EXPRESSION: "HE SHALL BE CALLED A NAZARENE." EXPOSITION OF MATT. II. 23. From Hengstenberg's 'Christologie,' Vol. II. Translated by the Editor	182
Dionysius, etc.	49		
ART. II. ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SENSE AND THE SIGNIFICATION OF WORDS AND PHRASES. Translated from <i>Morus</i> , by Prof. Torrey,	61		
ART. III. ON THE HYPOTHESIS OF THE EGYPTIAN OR INDIAN ORIGIN OF THE NAME JEHOVAH. By Prof. Tholuck. Translated by the Editor	89		
ART. IV. ON THE TIME OF OUR LORD'S LAST PASSOVER AND			

NO. XIV.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. ON THE CATECHETICAL SCHOOL, OR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT ALEXANDRIA IN EGYPT. <i>Part Second</i> . By Prof. Emerson	189	TO THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. Original	398
Doctrines. I. Inspiration etc. of the Scriptures	190	Preliminary Note	398
II. Theology	191	Historical View, etc.	399
III. Creation	196	Eastern Stem	334
IV. Providence	200	Western Stem	336
V. The Trinity	204	A. Eastern Slavi.	
ART. II. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN LIFE IN CONNEXION WITH THE CHURCH, AS DEVELOPED AMONG HEATHEN CHRISTIANS. From Neander's Hist. of the Apostolic Age. Translated by the Editor	241	I. Hist. of the Old Slavic Lang. and Lit.	345
ART. III. HINTS AND CAUTIONS RESPECTING THE GREEK ARTICLE. By Prof. Stuart	277	II. " Russian Lang. and Lit.	358
ART. IV. HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE SLAVIC LANGUAGE IN ITS VARIOUS DIALECTS: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE		First Period	362
		Second do.	368
		Third do.	379
		Fourth do.	377
		III. " Servian Lang. and Lit.	369
		1. Servians of the Greek Church	393
		(a) Servians, Bosnians, etc.	393
		(b) Bulgarians	400
		2. Servians of the Roman Catholic Church, or Dalmatians	401
		(a) Glagolitic Literature	401
		(b) Secular Dalmatian do.	402
		IV. " Croatian Lang. and Lit.	407
		V. " Lang. and Lit. of the Vindes or Sloveni	409
		ART. V. LITERARY NOTICES. By the Editor	413

NO. XV.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE SLAVIC LANGUAGE IN ITS VARIOUS DIALECTS; WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. Continued.	417	2. Lang. of Lower Lusatia	531
B. Western Slavi.		Appendix	531
I. Hist. of the Bohemian Lang. and Lit.	417	ART. II. THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH. By Bishop Munter.	
First Period	425	Translated by E. C. Tracy	533
Second do.	431	Introductory Note	533
Third do.	445	Part I. Planting of Christianity	534
Fourth do.	455	II. Schools and Learning	584
Fifth do.	459	ART. III. GREEK AND ENGLISH LEXICOGRAPHY. From the	
II. Lang. and Lit. of the Slovaks	464	London Quarterly Review	556
III. Hist. of the Polish Lang. and Lit.	471	Preliminary Note	556
First Period	477	Review	558
Second do.	479	ART. IV. THE LAMENT OF DAVID OVER SAUL AND JONATHAN. TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY. By the Editor	595
Third do.	481	Introduction	595
Fourth do.	492	Translation	600
Fifth do.	497	Notes	601
IV. Languages of the Sorabian-Vendes, etc.	522	ART. V. LITERARY NOTICES	606
Obotrites	523	I. On the Zend Language and Zend-Avesta. From Prof. Kosegarten	606
Wiltzi	525	II. German Philosophy. From Prof. Beneke	610
Ukrians	525	III. Additional Notices on Slavic Literature	615
Sorabae or Lusatians	526		
1. Lang. of Upper Lusatia	529		

NO. XVI.

	Page.		Page.
ART. I. ON THE CATECHETICAL SCHOOL, OR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT ALEXANDRIA IN EGYPT. Part Third. By Prof. Emerson	617	IV. Wealth and Property	720
Doctrines. VI. Anthropology	642	V. Warfare and Predatory Excursions	724
V. The future state of man	642	VI. Blood-Revenge	732
ART. II. THE KARAITES AND OTHER JEWISH SECTS. From Henderson's Travels in Russia	663	VII. Hospitality	737
ART. III. ON THE ALLEGED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN JAMES AND PAUL. From the German of C. Frommann. Translated by D. Foedick, jr.	683	VIII. Females	743
ART. IV. ON THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS RESPECTING CHRIST. By C. G. Bretschneider. Translated by the Editor	705	IX. Sagacity in tracing Footsteps	745
ART. V. NOTES ON THE BEDOUINS. From Burckhardt	711	X. Horses	746
I. Mode of Encamping	712	XI. Camels	756
II. Food and Cookery	714	XII. Locusts	765
III. Industry	720	ART. VI. LITERARY NOTICES	766
		I. Modern Hebrew Mss. From Henderson	766
		II. Jewish Wedding. Illustration of Matt. XXV. From the same	770
		III. Further Notice of the Karaites	770
		IV. Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament	771
		V. Miscellaneous. New Works	773
		ART. VII. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE	775
		1. From Rev. W. H. Pearce to the Editor	775
		2. From Prof. Neander to the Editor	776
		INDEXES to Vol. IV	778

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. XIII.

JANUARY, 1834.

**ART. I. ON THE CATECHETICAL SCHOOL, OR THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, AT ALEXANDRIA IN EGYPT.**

By R. Emerson, Prof. of Ecclesiastical History, in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

Preliminary Remarks on the importance of Theological Education and a knowledge of its history.

In civilized communities, education moulds into its own shape the body politic which it pervades. Hence it ultimately does more, for good or for evil, than all other causes combined. In its widest acceptation, indeed, it virtually embraces all the moral causes which act on man.

Of course that part of history which treats of education, must be deemed of the highest consequence by every contemplative mind. So it has been regarded in every enlightened age and among every enlightened community, both ancient and modern, whether christian, mohammedan, or heathen. But especially is the history of education thus highly regarded among enlightened Christians. And well it may be thus preeminently regarded by them; for pure Christianity is light itself; of course it loves the light, and it delights in the history of this true knowledge, as being the very history of itself. But the history of this light, is nearly the same as the history of sound education.

And what in christian lands has kept alive, and guided, and

Vol. IV. No. 13.

1

diffused this light of education ? what, more than any, and more than all other instrumentality combined ? The incontrovertible answer is at hand—viz. the CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. When and wherever the true light has shined, it is they, under God, that have diffused it. This they have done by their preaching, by the books they have written, by the scriptures which they have translated, copied and diffused, by the schools they have instituted, and by the more private methods in which they have given instruction, and the general influence they have exerted in the promotion of knowledge. Scarcely a school or a college in christendom has come into existence or continued to flourish, without their aid and their guidance. Theirs is the merit, then, so far as the merit of man is to be mentioned, in this grand agency of temporal and eternal good.

And so on the other hand, we may say, that when the mantle of ignorance has been drawn over the eyes of the church, or the dark mists of error have filled the christian atmosphere, they are the class of men who must be held as peculiarly responsible. To them more than to all other men, has both the providence and the word of God, committed the key of knowledge, and theirs is the responsibility of opening and of shutting the resplendent temple.

Much has, indeed, been said, and truly said, in mitigation of the charge on them for suffering the dark ages to come on and overcloud the christian nations for a thousand years. There were causes, it is alleged, in the corrupt and decrepid state of the Roman empire, and in the condition of the savage hordes by whom it was overrun, which they could not counteract.* This is doubtless true, if we look only at the state of things when this catastrophe came down upon Europe. And the credit of the scanty light which was kept glimmering, is also to be awarded to the clergy, corrupt as they had become. But we may fairly go back beyond this period, and inquire ; Why did not their predecessors, in a more favored period, with resources most ample, truly convert and purify and save the Roman empire from its gathering darkness and approaching dissolution ? and why did they not, long before this general wreck, spread the gospel among these savage hordes themselves, and convert and civilize and enlighten even *them* ? The Apostles, few and poor as they were,

* See Tholuck on Heathenism, in the Biblical Repository, Vol. II.

would have done it had they survived to half that period of time.

With this brief glance at the whole state of the case, then, we may return with the charge, and say, that even in that case, which is the strongest that history affords, the clergy were deeply responsible for that whole millennium of darkness and moral death that overspread the civilized world, and from which Europe itself, the very land of the reformation and of resuscitated science, has not yet recovered,—nor will it, perhaps, recover for a century to come.

But here it may well be remarked, that this recovery to genuine christian light and sound education, is to be ascribed to the same class of agents—christian ministers. Without them, the revival of literature, had it occurred at all, would have produced no better state of morals than it did among the Saracens in the days of their literary glory ; or among the people of France in our own age.

The clergy, then, are the masters of education, and responsible for it ; and theirs, under God, is the chief honor of its blessings in christian lands.

This is an important point which I have deemed it needful to present as clearly to view as my brief limits will admit, for the purpose of showing something of the deep interest that attaches to the general subject before us, viz. *the christian education of the clergy themselves*. For if the clergy are commanded by God, and destined, by the very arrangements of his providence, to educate the people, a tenfold importance is at once seen to accrue to the education of these same ministers of sacred knowledge and improvement. Their education is virtually the education of the whole ; and a radical fault or a primary excellence here, must extend, in its effects, with a widening, deepening influence, throughout the whole sphere.

From this view of the subject, I may here remark, that we readily find the solution of a problem of no ordinary difficulty in its first aspect. The problem is this : If the clergy have always been the guides and masters of education, how has it come to pass that, in different countries and ages, such opposite courses have been pursued ? such a difference found in the zeal with which they have been prosecuted ? and such a contrast in the results ? The solution is to be sought in the character of the clergy themselves : and this variation in their char-

acter, is to be traced to their education as the prime cause under God.

The variations, then, in the education of the priesthood, and the causes which produce these variations in kind or degree, afford a topic of the very first importance in historical research. These are the seminal causes ; small in their origin, perhaps, as the grain of mustard seed ; imperceptible as the leaven ; and recondite as the source of the winds ; but which fill the world, and fill eternity with their effects !

It will here be remembered, as I have already intimated, that I use the term *education*, in its broad sense, comprising not merely the scientific and literary training of youth, but the whole formation of the mind and character, including the active, moral, and religious principles, as well as intellectual culture.

While ministers have been responsible for the general education of the other classes in christian communities, their own education has been guided by themselves, each generation giving the bias and the impulse to its successor. How has this been done, from time to time ? in what manner and with what effect, has this most responsible of all the duties of the leaders in the sacred ministry, been discharged ? This is the grand question in ecclesiastical history ; and, indeed, in the whole history of christian nations. It is also that which lends the highest importance to the much more glaring and thrilling events of successive ages. For where such events have had a reflex bearing on this primary cause, where they have poured their healing or their polluting infusion back into this perennial fountain, their effects have been found diffusive and lasting. Such for instance were the early persecutions, so needful to check the rising ambition of the man of sin in the new community that was spreading in its youthful vigor through the world, conquering and to conquer. And such, on the other hand, was the effect of the conversion of Constantine and his accession to imperial dominion, and the consequent union of church and state, so fatal to the spiritual hopes and heavenly training of the clergy ! Then, the needful check was removed ;—he that had *let*, was taken out of the way. But when some secular event occurs that affects not this fountain of moral influence, however terrific may be the passing scene, it is but the thunder of the black cloud, without its tempest ; the comet that glares through the sphere, but deranges not its movements ; as a living writer has termed it, the wind, that bows down for a day the rich grain, but not the hail

that beats it to the earth. Tomorrow all is erect and flourishing as ever.

Such are many of the desolating wars that involve kingdoms, and change dynasties, but leave the arrangements of religion untouched. But not so the accession of a prince who meddles, however peacefully, with sacred institutions; and not so, the rise of a new doctrine, or a new mode of applying the influence of gospel teachers. And not so, in the primitive ages of the church, was the accession of some famous heathen philosopher to the christian cause, who assumed indeed the badge of the cross, but also still proudly wore the philosopher's garb—a fit emblem of the heathenism it still covered, and with which he was about to infect the church.

Such accessions were an apparent triumph, but proved, in the event, a real and lasting curse to the sacred cause. And in the same manner I might go on to speak of the baptized pride of some conspicuous converts in more recent ages, who are hailed as trophies of grace, but who come into the church, not to adore her Lord, but to be adored themselves—not to help onward in the good old way of truth and harmony and love, but to find or to make some new way to heaven, on every mile-stone of which they may inscribe forever their own renown. I might also remark on the leavening influence of the more unpretending individual who introduces a new philosophy. Whether such philosophy *begin* in the church or out of it; and whether it pertain at first to matter or to morals; if it gain a lasting eminence, its spirit ere long embues the priesthood and works changes, good or bad, in the cause of religion and human welfare, which surpass in importance the rise or fall of the greatest temporal kingdoms. The empire of Aristotle has been to that of his mighty pupil who conquered the world, as the sun to the transient glare of a meteor. This old dead heathen even reigned as supreme pope over the church for a thousand years. The retrieving conquests of Bacon are still extending, and are more momentous in their benign effects, than all the combined powers and wisdom of his mighty cotemporaries in the cabinet and in the field. The achievements of our own Edwards in his humble study, are destined to promote a more glorious revolution in the family of man, than even those of Washington himself.

These, and all other causes which have materially affected the education, the doctrines, or the practical efficiency of the clergy, are surely objects worthy of prime consideration and deep study

to every one who would understand the great principles of God's dispensations on earth, or who would derive the most practical lessons from the history of his church. Tell me how to rear an Edwards, and I will not trouble you for the inferior art of rearing secular princes or statesmen. Tell us how to raise up a whole generation of such ministers of the gospel as Edwards and his pupil Brainerd, and you tell us how the millennium is to be produced, when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, and when these princes and statesmen themselves even shall be all taught of God how to rule in a manner which no human wisdom can reveal.

In addition to this general view of the importance of theological education, I may add, that it is peculiarly important for us at the present day, and especially in this country, to investigate this science with the greatest care. Never has there been an age since the first spread of Christianity, in which ministers were so imperiously called for, both at home and abroad ;—never an age in which the number of evangelical ministers was so rapidly increasing ;—never an age in which so much training in knowledge, human and divine, was needed ;—and never, when the system of training was apparently receiving so great an improvement. From all these sources, the voice is loud and imperious, commanding us to investigate this subject to the bottom. If we are to make real improvements, instead of introducing defects, it becomes us to give heed to this voice ;—to be awake to the dangers, while we are alive to all the benefits, that may be introduced in this momentous process.

But upon whom is it especially incumbent to investigate this subject ? Upon those, of course, who have the special guidance of clerical education. And who are they ? The answer has already been given ;—the clergy themselves. It is not merely upon that portion of ministers *who have the charge of theological seminaries*, whether as teachers or guardians. It devolves in a measure upon them all ; for all are to have a voice by their influence on the rising generation in the christian community, in deciding what kind of training shall be pursued in these sacred retreats. What any community shall finally demand, in such a republican land as ours, they will ultimately have. While the seminaries will exert a most powerful influence in moulding the christian community and guiding their sentiments, this community, on the other hand, will exert a reciprocal influence on them. And it may be further stated, that the

responsibility is to devolve mainly on the christian ministry at large, of deciding the important problem, *Whether theological seminaries are to be sustained in future as the chief means of clerical education.* This high question, we are not yet warranted to regard in any other light than that of a practical problem, of the deepest interest to the welfare of Zion, which still remains to be solved. How can it be otherwise at present? The experience of a single score of years, with but a very limited knowledge of kindred institutions in other lands and other ages, and under far different circumstances, is by no means sufficient to a final decision on the merits of a system, involving so many remote consequences, and which must necessarily require much time for the full development of its influences. Theory, however plausible, is not enough for the safe determination of a question so important and so complicated, nor is the promising commencement of its trial on a large scale and by so many denominations, a certain index of the result.

That this problem should be *truly* solved, is of the utmost importance. For the christian ministry prematurely to take it for granted, that this is henceforth to be the way of training successors in the sacred office, and for them consequently to close their eyes to the further developments of the nature of the system, may possibly be fraught with the most disastrous consequences. Nor will they, in this land of vigilance, thus close their eyes. This is not the besetting danger of our country or of the revolutionary age in which we live. The current propensity is rather to change, and, like the Athenians, to seek for "something *newer*;" and thus to abandon a promising experiment before it is half tried, provided it be complicated, and its developments slow, and some of its unlooked for results apparently adverse. Many a suspected Jonah is now thrown overboard, at the first lowering of a tempest—which tempest after all is destined only to rouse the mariners and to waft the ship more speedily to her desired haven. Now, should some unhappy results occur, or some ill-boding appearances be presented, to alarm the fears and excite the suspicions of the watchmen on the walls of Zion; and should they then too hastily sound the deep alarm and withdraw the confidence and patronage of the churches, not merely from some one or two but from *all* theological seminaries, an injury might be inflicted on the rising welfare of the sacred cause, which half an age would not repair. Should, for instance, the appearance of collision

between different seminaries, be descried, or should indications of a departure from the faith, become but too apparent in some of them, (which may God prevent) ; in a word, should any merely temporary or partial or local disappointment be apprehended, or even deeply experienced, how unpropitious might prove the hasty attempt to subvert, instead of remedying, a whole system, that in itself may prove an unspeakable blessing to the church and the world.

It is on the ministry, I say, that devolves the decision of such important questions as these ; for in their hands rests the ultimate decision of all questions pertaining to the guidance of theological education. It is, then, a matter of prime consequence, that they be prepared to decide *right*.

Here, now, a further question is presented, and one on which I have had my eye in the whole of the preceding discussion : How are they to be prepared for so responsible a duty ? It is easy to answer, in the first place, that they should be led to feel deeply the responsibility of the act. This is sufficiently manifest from the brief view of its importance just exhibited. And this responsibility, each individual should feel in every exertion of his influence which has a bearing on such a question : For it is not by an assembled synod of the whole clerical body, that such matters are to be decided in our day, nor, as we trust, in any future day ; much less is it by the voice of some pope, or patriarch, or bishop. It is by the guidance of the general will ; the illumination or the deception of the general mind. And towards this illumination or deception, each one contributes his share by every act and every opinion he puts forth on the subject. And this is just as true of the theological student himself, as of the man who is already in the ministry. Let, then, this responsibility be first deeply felt, and a lively interest will thence be excited in the remaining answer to be given to the question of preparation for the discharge of such duty. If we are deeply responsible for diffusing light, we anxiously inquire, whence are we to gain this light ourselves ? where are the sources to which we may resort ?

This leads me to remark, in the second place, that, to the extent of his means, *each one should become familiar with the history of theological education*. To reject the experience of past ages and other countries, on such a subject, is just as absurd as to blot out the record of our own experience, or to extinguish the eye of our own reason. It is mainly by the history of the past in connexion with a knowledge of the present, that

we are to be guided in the preservation of real improvements, and guarded from baneful innovations. Why should we be left to act over again, for the hundredth time, the follies of our predecessors? And why should posterity be left to invent anew what we of the present age may have invented, for the tenth time, in the way of real improvement? Such may again be the fact, if human fickleness be not checked by the sage monitions of history. These are our safest guides for ascertaining what is truly good, and the means of preserving it; while they afford also the index to the path of future improvement. History, well studied, is no longer to be stigmatized as the timid extinguisher of enterprise, or the austere dictator by way of prescription. Showing, not only good and evil, but also the true causes of both, it affords at once the most safe directions and the most powerful incitements to further improvement. While it teaches us how to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good, it bids us go on to perfection.

It has already been intimated, that the pages of ecclesiastical history are filled with the records of clerical education. We see how Christ trained the *first* preachers of his gospel; and also what precepts *they*, in their turn, gave to those they were rearing for their successors. We see how popery trained *her* ministers, from period to period of her darkening and domineering sway. And we see how the glorious reformation, in different stages of increasing light, has been training *hers*.

But the whole field of theological education, is too extensive to admit of minute inspection at once. We turn, for the present, to a particular spot. And to what can we better turn, as promising to cast light on the great experiment now making, than to the early history of theological seminaries. If ancient records have any knowledge to impart respecting the utility, the dangers, and the management of such seminaries, we cannot fail of taking a deep interest in the account; and where these records may be barren of practical information on such points, it may be well for us to know the fact, that we may not suffer from the suspicion of wilfully neglecting a source of knowledge, on topics so interesting to the ministry and the church at the present day.

The results of such an investigation have not, to my knowledge, been given in our language, though we occasionally meet with a brief notice of such schools in our writers on ecclesiastical history.

ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL.

HAVING endeavored, in my preliminary remarks, to show, in some measure, the importance of theological education and of an acquaintance with its history, I now proceed to give some account of that portion of its history which is more immediately connected with the ancient school of theology at Alexandria.¹ It is my design first to exhibit a general view of the school, and then to treat of what was taught in it. I begin with its

Commencement and Duration.

Some of the christian fathers appear to speak of this seminary as having existed in the first century, and Jerome mentions a tradition of his time, which assigns St. Mark as its founder. In like manner, St. John was said to have established a school at Ephesus, and Polycarp was regarded as the founder of another at Smyrna. But little credit is due to these reports, so far as schools of the kind now in question are concerned.² The mistake may be easily accounted for on the supposition, that some early provision was made in these cities, and perhaps by these primitive teachers, for the instruction of *catechumens* in the

¹ My principal guide in the following account, is the very able and learned work by H. E. F. Guericke, *de Scholae Alexandrinae Catecheticae Theologia*, published at Halle, 1825. It may not be improper here to observe, that where I have made use of his work, I have generally consulted the original authorities to which he refers, especially in those cases in which he does not give his quotations in the original. It is needless here to specify the further helps employed, and the authorities for facts; as both will be rendered sufficiently apparent by a constant reference to such helps and sources as are used. I only add, that my references to Mosheim's *Ecc. Hist.* are to the new translation by Dr Murdock, published at New Haven 1832; and the references to the works of Clemens Alexandrinus and of Origen, are to *Sanct. Pat. Opera, Wirceburgi*, 1777—1794. In other references of importance, the edition will be noted at the time, if the reference be by vol. and page.

² See note to Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 98. and Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. III. p. 188. ed. 2.

first principles of Christianity; but this is a widely different thing from the preparation of men to preach the gospel, as it embraced only a course of instruction to candidates for baptism. It is not till some time in the latter half of the second century, that any distinct evidence is found, in ancient writers, of men who were *trained for preachers* in schools established for the purpose. This higher kind of school may have grown out of the other or have been reared on its foundation, and retained the same name; just as the Theological Seminary here has arisen on the foundation of the original school, Phillips Academy.

And, indeed, as in this modern case, so in the ancient one at Alexandria, we have no reason to suppose that the institution ceased to contain a department for inferior branches, when it became a school of theology; for we learn from Eusebius, (VI. 3, 4, 15,) that catechumens and such as were just baptized, *νεοφύτιστοι*, were found among the scholars of Origen, and were at first taught by him the elements of Christianity, but afterwards committed to his assistant, Heraclas. It is also manifest that christian *youth* were taught in this school. Eusebius (VI. 6) speaks of Origen when a boy as being taught here by Clement.

It is not easy to determine the precise date of the seminary at Alexandria. There is a degree of probability that it was a resort for theological students under Athenagoras as early as the year 160; but possibly, not till the time of Pantaenus, about 181. In all probability, as a theological seminary, it arose gradually from small beginnings, not being endowed with funds or established by any public act of authority. If we suppose Athenagoras to have been at first employed as a teacher of catechumens, and to have begun by degrees to discharge the higher office of instructing such students in divinity as might desire his aid; and that thus the inferior school gradually assumed the higher character, we shall probably come as nigh the truth as it is possible to ascertain it, from the scanty and apparently conflicting accounts that are left us. But more of this in the sequel. Thus much is certain, that the seminary was in successful operation, as a divinity school, under Pantaenus, near the close of the second century.

This school at Alexandria was also the first of the kind, and the most important. Others were soon formed on the same model at Caesarea, Antioch, Edessa, etc.

As to the time and manner of its termination, about the same

degree of doubt is left in the writings of the fathers, as in the case of its origin; and probably from the same cause. As it seems gradually to have arisen from a mere school of catechumens, so we are left to conclude that it as gradually subsided into the same inferior grade; for we hear no more of it as a divinity school, after the time of Theodosius the Great, A. D. 395, when Rhodo left it.¹ We may then consider the period of its duration as a little more than two hundred years, viz. from about A. D. 160 to 395.

Occasion and Object of its Existence.

During the apostolic age, God appears to have granted special aid and a special commission to those whom he would put into the ministry of his word, by the gift of tongues, and perhaps by other miraculous qualifications. How long such gifts were continued to the church, we know not; but we may reasonably conclude from history and the analogy of divine providence, that they were *gradually* withdrawn, as the exigency subsided. Thus left, by degrees to train her own teachers, the church soon began to feel her need of the regular means. She found herself assailed from without by all the learning and subtlety of heathen philosophy and Jewish envy; and from within, by a swarming host of heretics. To meet the power and craft of such assailants, learning and skill, as well as glowing piety, were demanded. And these could better be imparted by men who should devote their whole time to the work of instruction, than by those whose chief occupation was preaching.

It is likewise supposed by some, that the Christians were induced to emulate the example of heathen philosophers, in the establishment of schools in which the *true philosophy from heaven* might be taught, instead of what treated of heathen Gods; and especially in the city of Alexandria, where a splendid heathen establishment was then flourishing.²—Thus much for the occasion which called this and kindred seminaries into being.

The *object* of the institution, requires a few remarks in addition to what is implied in the preceding. The ultimate de-

¹ Guerike, Part I. p. 118.

² See Guerike, Part I. p. 11.

sign was, to prepare men for the ministry. But to this end, a course of training in grammar, logic, languages, philosophy, etc. was pursued.¹ The Christians were not then in possession of inferior seminaries in which the requisite acquisitions in literature and science could be gained. But to what extent such branches of secular knowledge were pursued in this school, we are not informed. This, however, is certain, that some of the most distinguished teachers of the school, were extremely fond of such studies, and regarded them as of the highest importance to the christian student. Origen, as appears from a passage in his letter to Gregory Thaumaturgus, regarded philosophy as a highly important preparative and aid to christian doctrine.² Clement also, in many places,³ commends the Grecian philosophy as fitted to clear the way and prepare the soul for the reception of the faith. Both he and Origen, and also Athenagoras, were deeply versed in secular knowledge, as their writings amply testify. The same was doubtless true in general of the other teachers, as is implied in what Rufinus says of Didymus, (II. 7,) viz. "He attained to such learning and knowledge in divine and human things, as to become a teacher in the ecclesiastical school." Such knowledge was therefore requisite for the office. And we have proofs enough that it was employed in their course of teaching, by these enthusiastic lovers of human as well as divine learning.⁴

It may be proper here to make a few remarks on the

Management of the School.

From the scanty materials on this topic, the following may be gleaned as the most probable facts.

The government was chiefly in the hands of one man, as rector or prefect, who was also the principal teacher in the higher branches. Thus Origen, as before stated, at an early period taught catechumens and such as had recently been admitted to the church by baptism ; but at a subsequent period, he committed this inferior branch of instruction to Heraclas

¹ Guerike, Part I. p. 104 and seq.

² See Guerike, Part I. p. 106.

³ Strom. I. Guer. P.I. p. 105.

⁴ Guer. See P. I. p. 107.

whom he appointed as his assistant. In proof of there being one head, or rector, it is urged by Guerike,¹ that this position appears to be implied by the uniform language of the fathers when speaking of the school. They every where speak of a single man as being master of it for the time. Thus Eusebius speaks of Pantaenus, Clement, Origen, Heraclas, etc.² Philip Sidetes also gives a catalogue of these rectors. But while one was always principal of the school, he not unfrequently had at least one associate, and perhaps an assistant besides. How many associates and assistants were employed, cannot be determined, as it is only from incidental remarks here and there in the early writers, that we come to know of any. In one instance, in time of persecution under Severus, we learn that Origen was left with the sole charge.³ We are not warranted to conclude that there were, at any one time, more than three teachers, including the principal; not often more than two; and frequently, but one.

To the rector, with his coadjutors, was doubtless committed the general management of the seminary. This we may infer from the nature of the case, and from the fact that the school flourished; for no seminary, of whatever kind, can prosper where the management is not chiefly confided to the teachers.

But while such was evidently the fact, it still appears that the bishop of Alexandria exercised some kind of general supervision over the school and its teachers. For when Pantaenus and Clement were driven away by persecution, A. D. 203, Demetrius, the bishop, appointed Origen to the sole charge of the school.⁴ On other occasions, he exhorted Origen to diligence in his work of catechising.⁵ He was also applied to by the governor of Arabia to send Origen to teach him the principles of Christianity, with which request he complied. And again, when Origen was too long detained in Palestine, Demetrius recalled him by letters and messengers; and at a later period, he excommunicated this catechist.⁶ In a subsequent age, Didymus was approved of by bishop Athenasius and other wise men, as a teach-

¹ Part I. p. 109. et. seq.

² Euseb. VI. 6. 26.

³ Euseb. VI. 3.

⁴ Euseb. VI. 3. Hieron. c. 54.

⁵ Euseb. VI. 8. 14.

⁶ Euseb. VI. 19. 26.

er in this school.¹ The fact hitherto has not been disputed, so far as I can learn, that the seminary was under the supervision of the bishop of Alexandria ; but on this point I may have some further remarks to make in connexion with facts to be adduced in the sequel. I will barely add, in this place, that from the last cited authority, we may perhaps equally conclude that "other wise men" besides the bishop, were concerned in the supervision ; and that we know but little of the nature and extent of this authority, supposed thus to have been exercised, or whether any rules were prescribed by the higher authority for conducting the affairs of the seminary, or whether any particular course of studies was marked out.

We now turn to another question, viz.

Why did the first seminary rise and flourish at Alexandria, rather than elsewhere ?

A brief discussion of this point, will subserve a higher purpose to our general object, than the mere gratification of curiosity. The facts brought to view, will present sources of influence which could not fail materially to modify the school itself, and make it what in fact it became. Considering the influence which the place must have had on the seminary, it is obvious that any account of the latter must be very imperfect, without some notice of the moral causes that were in operation in the city itself.

Alexandria, situated at the western angle of the Delta of Egypt, in latitude $31^{\circ} 11'$ N. was built by Alexander the Great, 332 B. C. Designing it as the capital of his mighty empire, and connecting with it the glory of his own name, he spared neither toil nor expense in its erection. The Ptolemies followed up his plan, and in the genuine spirit of Greeks, as they were by descent, they successfully strove to add literary glory to the commercial renown of their capital. In pursuance of this plan, philosophers and sages of every land and every sect, were invited to make it their abode. Its propitious location for commercial and other intercourse between the two great portions of the ancient world, the East and the West, was greatly conducive to the purpose of rendering it the emporium of literature as well as of commerce. Such it became. In its most flourishing period, it is supposed to have contained not less than 300,000 in-

¹ Rufinus, II. 7.

habitants, besides a countless host of passing strangers. By means of canals, this city was connected with the Red sea, and thus became the great thoroughfare between the East and the West. Merchants and travellers from every clime, were here to be met with. The city was also peopled, at first, by a motley assemblage of Greeks, Jews, and Egyptians. Thus the efforts of the Ptolemies in attracting foreign literati, the central position of the city, and the sources of its first population, all conspired to make it the world in miniature, exhibiting a sample of all kinds of men and things. And so it continued to be, in a measure, until European commerce and intercourse with the East, were diverted from this ancient channel by the discovery of the passage round the cape of Good Hope, by the Portuguese, in the fifteenth century.

In this general rendezvous of all nations, this πανδοχείον for all tribes, almost any thing, good or bad, might grow up unmolested; and here, if any where, a school of the hated, despised, and persecuted Christians, might be suffered to rise and flourish. On this common ground of all nations, of all sects, and of all creeds in religion and in philosophy, — where Indian brahmins, Jewish priests, Persian magi, and Grecian philosophers of every cast, might freely meet, and have their respective schools, and hold just as much or as little intercourse as they pleased; — in such a place of general congress and universal tolerance, Christianity might find her best hopes of rearing a peaceful establishment, for teaching a better philosophy than the concentrated wisdom of the world could present or devise.

Here, too, were means of instruction not elsewhere to be found. These consisted partly in this assemblage of literary men of all nations, and partly in the secular schools and libraries already existing at Alexandria.

The famous libraries in that place began to be collected by Ptolemy Soter, the successor of Alexander, and were increased by his successors, especially by Ptolemy Philadelphus, under whom the Septuagint translation is said to have been commenced. One of these libraries was placed in the Museum, and consisted of 400,000 volumes; and the other, consisting of 300,000, was placed in the Serapion, or temple of Jupiter Serapis. The first was burned in the siege by Julius Cæsar; but replaced by the library of Pergamus, which Antony presented to Cleopatra. The other is thought by some to have been destroyed or dispersed in the time of Theodosius the Great (395),

when he ordered all heathen temples to be destroyed ; and not by the ruthless Arabs under Omar, as is generally believed. The largest, in the Museum, probably suffered much, if it was not entirely destroyed with that splendid building, in the civil commotions under Aurelian.¹ Both, however, were in existence at the time of founding the christian school ; and, for aught we know, accessible to Christians as well as heathen.

Schools of the highest fame were also flourishing there. The term *Museum* was applied equally to designate a building, or rather a portion of the royal buildings, in which the great library was kept, and also a college of learned men and scholars who lived together, and were supported by royal bounty, under the Ptolemies and under some of the Roman emperors. Here were taught philosophy, astronomy, physic, grammar, poetry, history, mathematics, and almost all the arts and sciences of antiquity.² This college was founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus, and continued to flourish till after the time we are considering.

What an inducement must obviously have been presented in these facilities for knowledge, to the establishment of a christian seminary in that city ;—the greatest libraries in the world, said to contain copies of all books then known ; the greatest concourse of scholars and literary men ; the greatest facilities for becoming acquainted with the languages and customs of all countries, by personal intercourse with both the learned and unlearned from such countries ; and the best opportunities for preaching the gospel to foreigners, who, like ‘the dwellers at Jerusalem out of every nation under heaven,’ might return with this gospel to bless their countrymen. Such considerations could not have escaped the notice of men like Pantaenus and Origen, who themselves went abroad, the one to India and the other to Arabia, to preach the gospel. How eagerly would such a place be selected, at the present day, for a theological seminary. How admirably adapted, should we regard it, as the seat of a missionary school.

But these facilities for learning and usefulness, must also be contemplated in the character of *moral causes*, which could not fail of exerting a powerful influence on the school itself. On the one hand, there was much to excite pious activity and kindle a glowing zeal to convert these philosophers and strangers, and

¹ See Encyclop. Amer. Art. *Alexandria and Alexandrian School*.

² Guer. P. I. p. 10. Strabo, XVII. 8.

to fire the breasts of the young men to carry the gospel to those remote regions. But, on the other hand, there were the powerful temptations to an over-weening fondness for profane literature, and to an ambitious desire of philosophic glory; — temptations, alas! which proved but too strong for both pupils and teachers, as we may have occasion to see in the sequel.

It is supposed by some, that the christian school had its origin in the Museum; or rather that the Museum itself was converted into such a school.¹ Such an opinion may have gained plausibility from the acknowledged fame of these christian teachers among heathen philosophers, and from the fact of their having paid so much attention to philosophy, and their mingling it with Christianity. Still, there is no good foundation for the opinion, but strong evidence against it. It is by no means probable that heathen emperors, even while persecuting Christianity, would suffer an institution under their own patronage, and one of so much importance and celebrity, to be changed into a school of christian prophets. It would require the strongest positive evidence for the support of such an opinion. But, instead of this, there is direct proof to the contrary. For the Museum was destroyed by Caracalla,² when the tyrant took savage vengeance on the Alexandrians for ridiculing him, (about 216), and was not restored till the time of Constantine; whereas the christian school was in operation during this whole period.³ The emperor Julian appears also to have sent Zeno to the Museum as a teacher; but no such teacher is found among those employed in the catechetical school. They were therefore distinct and separate institutions.

In this connection, it is proper to inquire concerning the

Accommodations for the School.

It would, indeed, have been a very convenient thing for such an establishment, and much to the liking of its philosophic teachers, had they enjoyed the ample accommodations of the Museum, consisting in its magnificent public buildings for the residence of instructors and pupils, its gratuitous provision for the support of both, its halls of instruction, and its library as their own. But, so far from all this, we have no proof that

¹ So the Magdeburg Centuriators, I. 1, 7. p. 397.

² Dion. Cass. Hist. Rom. LXXVII. c. 7. 22.

³ Guer. I. p. 12.

they possessed any thing of the kind. From the scanty and incidental evidence that remains, we are left rather to infer that the christian doctors taught in their own private dwellings, at least in the earlier periods. Had they been otherwise furnished, some hint of the fact might well have been expected, especially if public provision of much importance, had been made. The only light we have, respects the case of Origen, who probably taught "in the house where he abode," *ἐν οἴκῳ, ἐνθα κατέμενεν*.¹ As this, however, was at the crisis when the older teachers had fled from persecution, and he was left to take care of the school alone, the circumstance, I acknowledge, is no decisive evidence against the existence of better accommodations at other times. I also admit the claim of a *probability*, that after the accession of christian emperors to the throne, they would afford some public provision for so important a school; as Constantine has the credit of making liberal provision for the instruction of christians.² We cannot readily believe him to have resuscitated the Museum,³ and at the same time to have left the christian school without endowment or public buildings. We should say, that either its inmates were previously supplied, or that he caused them to enjoy equal advantages with the other literati in the Museum, (perhaps having a separate department,) or, that he granted in some way what was so obviously needful to the dignity of the institution. Still, we are left without positive evidence.

But, after all, this famous christian seminary may perhaps have been, from beginning to end, much more in the shape of what we should now call a mere private school, than modern writers on the subject are wont to imagine;—without funds, without public buildings, without special guardians to appoint and watch over its teachers; and only under the general care of the bishop, while it should last, like other things in his diocese, and enjoying the friendly aid and confidence of good men, as it passed in succession from one set of teachers to another, till none were found to take it; and thus it may finally have become extinct without being formally abolished, just as it had arisen without any formal establishment.

¹ Euseb. VI. 3.

² Mosheim, Ecc. Hist. Cent. IV. P. II. c. 1. 4.

³ Guer. I. p. 12.

This is, indeed, as before suggested, far from being the light in which it seems now to be universally regarded; but still I cannot help suspecting that it is about all which recorded facts will warrant us in believing. The large number that were probably educated here, and the great influence which the seminary came to exert, afford no refutation of this view; nor need the view itself diminish our estimate of the importance of the school in any respect. Its results are matters of record, so far as we can know them, and pass for what they import, however Providence may have seen fit to bring them to pass.

The view I have here ventured to suggest, will receive some further countenance, while we inquire into the

Mode in which the Teachers were supported.

On this point, Guerike¹ dissents from the opinion of Michaelis, viz. that the Alexandrian teachers enjoyed no public stipends. He does not, however, attempt to prove, nor does he suppose, that any *public* stipend was afforded previous to the time of Origen; but he argues, that at a subsequent period, when the bishops and other officers of the church in Egypt are known to have enjoyed considerable incomes, the catechists would not be left without some public provision. And especially does he think this must have been the fact after the time of Constantine. But the only direct proof which he adduces to show that they enjoyed public support at all, is a passage from Cassiodorus,² a monk of the sixth century, which asserts a tradition (*traditur*) to that effect. The tradition may have been well founded, and from what has been just remarked as to the school under Constantine, I do not doubt its credibility as respects this later period. But it does not necessarily reach back beyond the time of this christian emperor. Now, for the previous period, there is much more slender ground for such a

¹ P. I. p. 114.

² Cass. Praefat. instit. divin. script. p. 307. "Nisus sum cum beatissimo Agapeto urbis Romae, ut, sicut apud Alexandriam multo tempore fuisse traditur institutum, nunc etiam in Nisibe civitate Syrorum Hebraeis sedulo fertur exponi, collatis expensis in urbe Romana professores doctores scholae potius acciperent christianae, unde anima susciperat aeternam salutem, et casto atque purissimo eloquio fidelium lingua comeretur."—*Quoted by Guer. ib.*

conjecture ; and even Guerike himself supposes, that Pantaenus and Clement received nothing except perhaps the gifts of their students ; and even these, when the school fell into Origen's hands, he declined ; for Eusebius informs us that he sold his books and subsisted on the avails at the rate of four oboli a day, rather than be beholden to those about him.¹ At that time, it is manifest there was no public stipend. And as to the conjecture of any having been provided when the church grew richer, it manifestly rests on the assumption, that the school had become a *public* institution, which is the very point I am calling in question, and which wants proof. We may say, that it *ought* to have been publicly endowed at this period, in so large a city and amid so much wealth of bishops and others. And so, it seems, thought Cassiodorus respecting his proposed endowment of such a school at Rome three hundred years after, and amid immensely greater wealth of the church.

As a further point of resemblance to a more private establishment, I remark, that the principals appear to have appointed their own assistants ; and that without perhaps even consulting the bishop. It was thus, as appears from Eusebius,² that Origen appointed Heraclas as his assistant in the lower branches of the school. All this is perfectly consistent with the views before given of the general superintendence of the bishop. Supposing the school a mere private establishment, yet as it was of great public importance to the church, the bishop might well consider it his duty to look after its interests, to see that it was continued by a succession of teachers, and to use all his influence in promoting its prosperity and urging the teachers to the faithful discharge of their duty. A common parish minister, at the present day, would do no less with respect to an important though private school among his people. It may be further remarked, that the direct authority which the bishop of Alexandria exercised over the teachers, appears to have been in his assumed capacity of bishop over his presbyters, rather than as governor of the school. It was thus that he excommunicated Origen ; which he did after Origen had voluntarily resigned his charge of the school and retired to Cæsarea.³ Still, we may well suppose a bishop, in those days of increasing arrogance, to have conducted himself with an air of authority towards this school, as towards

¹ Euseb. VI. 3.² Euseb. VI. 15.³ See note by Valesius to Euseb. VI. 26.

every thing pertaining to religion, which would ill comport with primitive simplicity and with our present views of clerical propriety; and yet this would not prove the school to have been of a public nature.

The Influence of the School and the number of its Pupils.

These may be conjectured from the nature of the case, and from incidental notices in the works of the fathers.

The men at the head of it were generally renowned for talents and learning. Some of them, as Origen, acquired fame among the heathen as well as among Christians.¹ They were among the most able men and conspicuous writers of their times, and exerted an almost boundless influence by their compositions, as well as by their direct efforts in the school.

As to the number of pupils, Eusebius frequently makes such allusions as to imply that they were very numerous. He says, for instance, of Origen, that "so many flocked to him that he had scarcely time to breathe, one company after another coming from morning to evening, to his school."² Many of the scholars were also distinguished for their proficiency, as it is recorded of some of the most conspicuous men in the eastern church at that period, that they studied under these preceptors. We may therefore regard as well founded the lively remark of Hospinian,³ that multitudes, renowned for learning and piety, issued forth from the school, as from the Trojan horse, and applied themselves to the blessed work of the Lord in the churches of the East.

That the school was in high repute and exerted an extensive influence, is amply apparent from the manner in which the fathers everywhere speak of it, as well as from the frequency with which it is mentioned. Eusebius calls it, the school of the faithful, ἡ τῶν πιστῶν διατριβή, and διδασκαλεῖον τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων, the school of sacred science, "which (he adds) we are informed, is furnished with men who are very able scholars, and industrious in divine things." He also gives it a variety of other designations, as τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖον, ἡ τοῦ

¹ Euseb. VI. 19.

² Euseb. VI. 15.

³ Quoted by Guer. I. p. 107.

κατηχεῖν διατριβή. Sozomen calls it τὸ ἱερὸν διδασκαλεῖον τῶν ἱερῶν μαθηματῶν. Jerome calls it *ecclesiastica schola*. Nicephorus, *θεία διατριβή, ἱερὸν διδασκαλεῖον*, and *ιερά δι-τριβή*.¹

It may not be out of place here to inquire, *Why the school was denominated catechetical?* The answer to this query may give us some clue to the mode of teaching.

I observe, then, that *κατηχεῖν* signifies *to sound in the ears of any one, to give oral instruction*. Hence, *κατηχητής*, a *cate-chist*, as the teachers of this school were severally called; and hence, too, *κατήχησις*, *instruction*, especially in the first elements, and as delivered *viva voce*. With great propriety might the primeval schools among Christians for the instruction of converts and children in the first elements of sacred knowledge, be denominated *catechetical* schools, the instruction being doubtless chiefly oral. Such was originally the school at Alexandria, as we have already seen. Now, as it appears to have changed its character *gradually*, it might very naturally retain its primitive designation; especially if we suppose the oral mode of teaching, which is particularly indicated by the term, to have been still continued. And this supposition is by no means an improbable one, as we have no evidence of a change in this particular.

We may then, without violence to existing evidence, imagine these venerable teachers, seated in the midst of their pupils "from morning to evening" as they thronged around them in successive classes,² and thus giving instruction, not in stiff and formal lectures coldly read from a manuscript, but with all the life and delight and ample illustrations of familiar conversation. And if so, what modern lecturer would not envy them their station? and what pupil would not crave a seat in this assemblage of ancient and paternal simplicity?

We come now to a still more important inquiry.

By whom was the School taught?

Who were these christian sages, that thus spent their lives in training preachers of the gospel? Some answer to this question

¹ Euseb. V. 10. VI. 3. Sozo. III. 15. Hieron. Catal. c. 38. Niceph. IV. 32.

² Euseb. VI. 15.

is indispensable to the completeness of our plan ; but the answer shall be as brief as the nature of the case will admit. After a notice of the lives of the catechists, we shall proceed to consider the *doctrines* which they taught.

And here, at the outset, for the sake of perspicuity, I will present the tabular view of these teachers, as drawn up by Guerike, with some trifling variations in the notation.

Tabular View of the Catechists.

Years.	Principals.	Assistants.
160*—181*	Athenagorast	
181*—190*	Pantaenus	
190*—203*	Pantaenus	Clement
203	Pantaenus. Clement	
203—206*	Origen	
206*—211*	Pantaenus. Clement.	Origen
211*—213*	Clement	Origen
213*	Origen	
213*—232	Origen	Heraclas
232	Heraclas	
233—265*	Dionysius	
265*—280*	Pierius*	
280*—282*	Pierius*	Achillas†
282*—290*	Theognostus*	Achillas†
290*	Theognostus*	
290*—295*	Serapion†	
295*—312	Peter Martyr*	
313—320*	Arius*	
320*—330*		
330*—340*	Macarius†	
340*—390*	Didymus	
390—395	Didymus	Rhodo*
395	Rhodo*	

* This sign denotes *probability* as regards the dates and the persons to which it is affixed. Parts of years could not be conveniently noted with accuracy in this table.

† The cross denotes *doubt*.

ATHENAGORAS.

Though placed at the head of this catalogue, very little is known of his history; and it remains a doubtful question whether he was ever a teacher in this school. None of the more early fathers either assert or deny the fact. Philip Sides, a loose but learned and voluminous writer of "Christian History,"¹ and who flourished in the time of Theodosius the Great, is the only author who mentions Athenagoras as one who presided over this school. This historian, though not worthy of much credit, may perhaps be believed in this particular, as he was himself a pupil of one of the Alexandrian catechists, and as he could have no perceivable motive to falsify in this particular.² He asserts, that "Athenagoras was the first who presided over the school in Alexandria." Guerike (in the passages above referred to) has clearly shown, that this assertion cannot be refuted, though some passages from the fathers, imperfectly understood, have been adduced to prove Pantaenus to have been the founder. The probability, as may be inferred from what I have before stated, is, that neither was, in the strict sense of the term, the *founder* of the school; but that it had been in existence, in its inferior character as a school for *catechumens*, perhaps even from the days of St. Mark. Under Athenagoras, it may have begun to assume the higher character of a theological seminary, which it afterwards more fully acquired under Pantaenus. Hence Pantaenus, being the first teacher of any great celebrity, is frequently mentioned; while none but Philip takes any notice of Athenagoras in this capacity.

Mosheim and the great majority of writers on the subject, espouse the opinion, that Athenagoras was one of the catechists in this school. Supposing him to have had the charge of the school, it still remains a question, *when* and *how long* he presided. Philip speaks of him as having flourished under the reigns of Adrian and Antoninus Pius; but Mosheim proves that it must have been at a later period, from the fact that his apology was composed in the time of Aurelius. Guerike,³ therefore, with the highest degree of probability, places the period in the latter half of the second century, from about the year 160 to 181.

¹ See Socrates, VII. 27.

² See Guer. P. I. pp. 4. 19.

³ P. I. p. 22.

A few words as to what we know of his general history.

From the title prefixed to his apology, we may infer that he was born at Athens. He styles it "An Apology for Christians, by Athenagoras, an Athenian, a philosopher, and a Christian." That he was a converted Gentile, is apparent from the following interesting incident recorded by Philip. "Being earnestly engaged to write for Celsus against the Christians, and reading the Sacred Scriptures that he might more completely refute them, he was so affected by the Holy Spirit, that instead of a persecutor, he became, like the great apostle Paul, a teacher of the faith which he had persecuted."¹ But where, or at what period of his life this took place, is not so apparent.

It would seem that he removed from Athens and went to Alexandria, where he taught the Platonic philosophy; and this, as is quite possible, in connexion with teaching Christianity; for he seemed still fond of styling himself "a philosopher" at the time of writing his apology, and doubtless continued, like many other converted philosophers, to wear their cloak as a distinctive badge.

The period of his death is alike uncertain with that of his birth. Perhaps it was at the time when Pantaenus took charge of the school, viz. A. D. 181.

Two small works of his remain to the present time, which are highly spoken of by Mosheim and others as evincing superior talent in composition, great learning, and a strong predilection for philosophy.² In his apology, already named, it is remarkable that he adduces passages from the *Old Testament*, but none from the *New*. He here defends the Christians from the charges of incest, of atheism, and of eating the flesh of murdered children; accusations so frequently, so cruelly, and yet so absurdly brought against them. In his work "On the Resurrection of the Dead," he argues wholly on principles of reason, to the neglect of the Scriptures, as his object was to meet the objections of philosophers. In this point, he is followed in Butler's incomparable work on the analogy between natural and revealed religion.

The effect of so early and so striking an example in favor of a taste for philosophy in the school, may well be considered as

¹ Guer. P. I. p. 22.

² Mosheim, Ecc. Hist. Cent. II. Part II. c. 2. 5.

great and permanent, especially when we consider the beauty and power of his compositions, which continued to be read when his living voice had become silent in death.

We pass now to some notice of his successor,

PANTAENUS.

Here, too, our knowledge is scanty as to many of the circumstances of the life of this distinguished teacher. When or where he was born, we know not. Philip Sidetes assigns Athens as his birth place. But as his pupil and successor, Clement of Alexandria, calls him a "Sicilian bee," many have been led to conclude that he was born in the island of Sicily. This appellation, however, may have been given him by his admiring pupil merely as indicative of his diligence or the excellence of his productions, as Sicily was proverbial for its "Hyblæan" honey. Photius speaks of him as "a disciple of those who had seen the apostles." According to Eusebius, "he was bred up in the precepts and institutions of the Stoics."¹ To this philosophy he continued to be much attached; and Cave, in his life of this father, observes, that he might well be fond of it, as the Stoics resembled the Christians in their moral principles much more than did any other sect of philosophers; for "they held, that nothing was good but what was just and pious, and that nothing was evil but what was vicious and dishonest; and that a bad man could never be happy, nor a good man miserable;" and that God's providence is universal, and he is to be adored by all.

It is manifest from the brief notice of Eusebius,² that Pantaenus took charge of the school in the beginning of the reign of Commodus, about A. D. 181. Here he probably continued in a regular course of teaching till A. D. 203, when himself and Clement, (who had become his assistant in A. D. 190,) were compelled to flee from the persecution under Severus; but in A. D. 206, he is supposed to have returned, and to have had the nominal, if not the active charge of the seminary, in connexion with Clement and Origen, till A. D. 211, about which time he died at a very advanced age.

At some time during his life, he appears to have performed a sort of mission among the people of *India*. Concerning this sacred expedition, three questions of some interest remain still

¹ Euseb. V. 10.

² Euseb. V. 9. 10.

undecided, viz. Where did he go? When? And at whose instigation? To each of these inquiries we will devote a moment's attention. But to do this to the best advantage, it may be well first to repeat the short notice which Eusebius has left us of this tour. I give it in the old translation of 1692. After speaking of Pantaenus as most eminent for his learning among those attached to the school of the faithful at Alexandria, Eusebius adds: "Moreover, 'tis said, he showed so great a willingness of mind and ardency of affection towards the publication of the divine word, he was declared the preacher of Christ's gospel to the nations of the East, and journeyed as far as India. For there were many evangelical preachers of the word even at that time, who, inflamed with a divine zeal, in imitation of the apostles, contributed their assistance to the enlargement of the divine word, and the building men up in the faith. Of which number Pantaenus was one, and is reported to have gone to the Indians. Where, as 'tis famed, he found the gospel according to Matthew, among some that had the knowledge of Christ there before his arrival; to whom Bartholomew, one of the Apostles, had preached, and left them the gospel of St. Matthew written in Hebrew; which was preserved to the foresaid times. Moreover, this Pantaenus, after many excellent performances, was at last made governor of the school at Alexandria; where, by his discourses and writings, he set forth to public view the treasures of the divine points."¹

We now proceed to inquire, in the first place, who were these *Indians* to whom Pantaenus went? Cave remarks, that men of no inconsiderable note have supposed them a colony from that part of India lying about the river Indus, who early removed and settled in Ethiopia; and in proof of the existence of such a colony, Eusebius and Philostratus are cited, the latter of whom calls the Ethiopians *a colony of Indians*, and *an Indian generation*.²

But to this supposition it appears a sufficient objection, that Eusebius speaks of Pantaenus as having gone to the *East*, not to the *South*, and having gone as far as *India*.

Another opinion, and one for which the authority of Jerome is cited, is, that they were what we should now understand by the people of India. There appears, however, to be no necessity for supposing this father to have taken so long a journey; but, on the

¹ Ecc. Hist. V. 10.

² See Cave, *Patres Apostolici*, p. 189.

contrary, there is a considerable degree of probability in the supposition, that he did not in fact go so far. For the name *Indians* was often given by the Greeks to the Arabians, Persians, and other nations in the *East*; ¹ and the fact that he found the gospel of Matthew among this people in Hebrew, left by Bartholomew, induces us to believe that the country was Arabia Felix, where that apostle is supposed to have labored, and where many Jews are known to have resided, who would of course be the sort of people to have the gospel in Hebrew, or in the Hebrew character, as that may be all which is meant by the expression. We may then, on the whole, conclude that this celebrated mission of Pantaenus was to some part of Arabia.

We now pass to inquire for the *time* of this mission. Cave and others suppose it to have been about ten years after the commencement of his office in the school. But as there is no notice of his leaving the school at this time, and as it is not probable that he would leave so important a station for such a purpose, we more rationally conclude, with Guericke, that this mission was performed before entering on his catechetical office. And with this position agrees the above cited account of the transaction as given by Eusebius.

It remains to inquire, at whose instigation the mission was undertaken. The account from Eusebius would lead us to believe it a benevolent project, originating in the ardent and devout mind of Pantaenus himself, and in accordance with the missionary spirit of his age. But Jerome speaks of his being sent by the bishop of Alexandria, at the solicitation of certain ambassadors from among the Indians. Both, however, may be true, as he may have formed this purpose first in his own mind, and subsequently such a request may have been made to the bishop from that people, to send them a man to teach them the way of God more perfectly, of which, as it would seem, they already had some knowledge. As to the degree of success attendant on this mission, we are not particularly informed.

Soon after his return, he most probably entered on the work of theological instruction; and doubtless much better prepared for infusing a practical and missionary spirit into his pupils, than he could have been by a merely sedentary and speculative life.

He is uniformly spoken of as a man of uncommon powers and acquisitions, and in language comporting with that already

¹ See note to Mosheim's *Ecc. Hist.* I. p. 120.

quoted from Eusebius. Mosheim supposes him to have been the first who composed explanations of the sacred volume.¹ None of his works are now extant, and he is thought to have given most of his instruction *viva voce*. That he profited greatly by his knowledge of profane literature, is asserted by Origen, his great coadjutor and one of his successors.

His immediate successor, however, was Clement, his former pupil and prime associate.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

This distinguished man is styled sometimes an Athenian and sometimes an Alexandrian, and both perhaps truly; as we may well suppose, with Cave,² that Athens was his birth place, while Alexandria was the chief theatre of his labors. He was originally a pagan philosopher, and travelled in quest of knowledge in Greece, Calabria, Palestine, and Egypt; and listened, as he informs us, to various teachers. One of his teachers was a Jew by birth; several were from the East; but the last and best of all whom he found, was the revered Pantaenus with whom he settled down in contentment. He speaks of these his christian preceptors generally in terms of high commendation, as "blessed and truly worthy and memorable persons,—preserving the sincere tradition of the blessed doctrine which they had immediately received from the holy apostles, Peter, James, John, and Paul."³ We may well suppose that during his travels, he also listened to the heathen philosophers of note who came in his way, though the fact is not expressly noted.

Whether he was converted before he reached Alexandria, does not appear; but we should naturally consider him as at least very favorably disposed towards the christian teachers, from the fact of his having listened to so many of them, and from his "carefully seeking out Pantaenus in Egypt," instead of casually meeting him. This, it is indeed possible, he may have done merely as a philosopher of the truly *eclectic* cast, for such he was in an eminent degree, as his writings and declarations assure us. In the spirit of this sect, then so flourishing, he might

¹ Ecc. Hist. I. p. 153.

² See his Life of Clem. Alex. p. 194.

³ Clem. Strom. lib. I. Euseb. V. II.

seek out every teacher of note, with the hope to glean something of truth from his lips. "I espoused," says he, "not this or that philosophy, not the stoic, nor the platonic, nor the epicurean or that of Aristotle; but whatever any of these sects had said that was fit and just, that taught righteousness with a divine and religious knowledge, all *that* being selected, I call *philosophy*."¹ Still, however, as Cave remarks, he seemed to lean chiefly to the stoics, and like them was extremely fond of paradoxes, as austere philosophers have generally been to the present day.

But whether it was before or after his hearing Pantaenus, that he embraced the doctrines of Christianity as a predominant part in his medley of philosophy, it might have been well for the church, as Milner suggests,² had neither he nor any of his brethren embraced any other philosophy than what is found in the word of God.

He undoubtedly united himself to the church in Alexandria, and there became a presbyter, but at what time, is uncertain. He is supposed to have commenced the office of teaching in the christian school, as an assistant to Pantaenus, about 190. Eusebius informs us that he succeeded Pantaenus as master of the school; and that Origen, while a boy, was one of his scholars.³ This declaration, while it contributes to fix the time, goes also to show us that he acted at first as an assistant only; for Pantaenus did not give up the school till after the period of boyhood was past with Origen. Cave supposes, indeed, that Clement had the entire but temporary charge of the school at this early period, while Pantaenus was absent on his Indian mission; but this is a mere supposition, for we have already seen that there is no proof of the school being thus left for a while by its principal; and that Pantaenus probably accomplished this mission before he took charge of the school at all. Guerike has fully shown,⁴ that nothing appears to invalidate the position he maintains, viz. that Clement continued in the simple capacity of usher from A. D. 190 to 203. At this latter period, both Pantaenus and himself fled for a while to Palestine, and left the school in the hands of Origen. The occasion of their flight, as before stated, was the persecution under Severus. He is supposed to have returned to Alexandria with Pantaenus A. D. 206, after an absence of three years; but this cannot be known for certainty, as

¹ Strom. I. Cave, p. 195.

² Milner's Ch. Hist.

³ Euseb. VI. 6.

⁴ P. I. p. 31 seq.

none of the fathers directly assert that he returned at all. Still there can be no doubt of his return at some time previous to A. D. 211, as he is known to have succeeded Pantaenus as principal of the school about this time. In this high office, Guerike supposes him to have continued about two years, and to have died A. D. 213. This opinion is founded on the fact, that Eusebius mentions Origen at that time as being oppressed with the overwhelming labors of the school, and as therefore appointing Heraclas to be his assistant. Were Clement then acting at the head of the school, the appointment of an assistant should have come from him, if indeed a further assistant besides Origen had been needed.¹ Others, however, as Cave and Schröckh, suppose him to have lived till A. D. 220.

His works were numerous and important. Some of them are lost. The most valuable of what remain, are the three following, which I will mention in the order in which he designed them to be studied in the progress of an individual from heathenism to the deepest knowledge of christian doctrine. The first is his *Λόγος Προτρεπτικός*, or "Exhortation" to the Greeks. The object of this work is to persuade pagans to become Christians. For this purpose he shows the absurdities of polytheism, and the truth and excellence of Christianity.—In the next work, he takes the recent convert from paganism and gives him such instruction as he deems needful in the case—milk, and not strong meat, as he is yet a babe in Christ. This work is accordingly denominated *Pædagogus*. It is designed to supply the place of a spiritual pedagogue, or instructor to such as are children in christian knowledge.—The last of his three principal works, is called *Στοιχεύματα*, which we should render *Miscellanies*. *Στοιχεύματα* signifies, literally, a coverlet of various colors, and, in the figurative sense, and plural number, it very aptly designates the parti-colored patchwork which is here put together. Clement himself compares it, not to a garden regularly laid out and arranged, but to a thick and shady mountain, covered with all kinds of trees, great and small, without order or similarity.² He mingled together scriptural truth and heathen philosophy, and passed from one subject to another in this work as his thoughts happened to flow. It is designed for what he would call a christian Gnostic, in a good sense; a full grown man who could digest strong meat. This last work is very frequently quoted by both ancient and modern writers.

¹ Euseb. VI. 15. Guer. I. p. 35. ² B. VII. at the close.

Clement is regarded as a man of vast learning, and of real piety ; but as most unhappily devoted to metaphysical speculation and heathen philosophy. He went so far as even to consider such philosophy a good preparation of the mind for the seed of divine truth¹—a most baleful principle indeed for one who was to teach christian theology, and to give tone to a christian seminary. With but one exception, he is said to have been more devoted to philosophic speculation than any other of the christian fathers. With his great learning and his philosophic fame, and in this early stage of the school, it becomes a matter of intense interest to mark, as we may be able, his probable influence on his pupils and his successors in office. For this purpose, the chief resource that remains for us, is the known character of these successors and a few of his pupils, and the general current of theological thought in the ages that immediately followed. Our present business, however, is more directly with his successors in office in the Alexandrian school. And whom do we next see there ?

ORIGEN.

This famous personage had been first the pupil of Clement, while only a boy. Afterwards, as we have seen, he was the fellow-laborer of that catechist, in the work of teaching ; and finally, his successor. We must also regard him as standing in the same relations essentially to the philosophizing Pantaenus. I have said above, that Clement was surpassed but by a single man among the fathers in a fondness for philosophic speculation in matters of religion. That individual was Origen,² the very individual whom we should expect to go beyond him, according to the current of the human mind, provided his abilities should prove adequate to the task of surpassing his master in this beguiling progress.

Let us now attend to some account of this extraordinary man. The facts on record are much more numerous than in the two former cases ; and as most of these facts are not only interesting and instructive in themselves, but serve to cast light on the state of the school and the age, I must be allowed some space in order to present them.

¹ See Guer. P. I. p. 105.

² Note to Mosheim's Ecc. Hist. Vol. I. p. 148.

Origen was born about the year 185, of christian parents, whose stated residence was at Alexandria, and who appear to have been respectable, and perhaps wealthy. At the time of his birth, it is generally supposed that they had retired to a mountainous region for a while to escape persecution, and that being born there they gave him the significant name of *Origen*, from the Greek, *ἐν ὄρει γενηθεὶς*.

His father, Leonidas, very assiduously taught him the elements of both sacred and profane learning, while a child, and so desirous was he especially to imbue his son's mind with sacred knowledge, that he caused him daily to commit to memory and repeat some portion of Scripture. Nor was the son less eager in the pursuit; for in addition to a knowledge of the language of Scripture, he was intent, like a genuine lover of learning, to decipher its full import. Accordingly he would often so urge his father for explanations of the *deep meaning* of the sacred language, that his father found it needful to repress his curiosity by telling him to be content with the *plain meaning*, and not search for what was above his years. Still, as Eusebius remarks, Leonidas greatly rejoiced in this forwardness, "and gave thanks to God for making him the father of such a son; and would often stand by the child while asleep, and, laying his breast bare, would kiss it with reverence, as if the sacred spirit of God had been enshrined in it." Thus early did Origen display the buddings of his mighty genius, and also that peculiar bent of his mind which gave character to his investigations through life, viz. a propensity, a passion even, to seek for recondite meanings. The like, in both of these respects, has often been remarked in the childhood of distinguished men.

But with Origen, there was something still more important than a mere love of knowledge. He soon evinced that his bosom glowed with an equal zeal for the practice of the truths he had learnt from the sacred pages. This was exhibited in the intense interest he showed in the cause of Christianity, at the time of the persecution under Severus, A. D. 202, which raged through all the churches, but fell with most tremendous devastation on the church at Alexandria, where many of the most distinguished Christians from other parts were brought to suffer martyrdom in this conspicuous city. So great was his love for these martyrs, and his zeal even for martyrdom itself, that he often came forward and exposed himself to the savage multitude, in order to minister to these holy men; and in several

instances, now and subsequently, he well nigh lost his life. His mother interposed her entreaties in vain, that he would desist from this voluntary exposure ; and she was finally compelled to hide all his clothes, and thus to keep him from going abroad. When this was done, and hearing that his own father was now apprehended, he wrote a most persuasive letter, exhorting him to remain firm to his purpose, and not shrink from death through any care he might feel for the family, who would thus be bereaved. Leonidas remained firm, and was beheaded ; and Origen with his mother and younger brothers, six in all, were left destitute of protection, and of property too, as the estate was confiscated.

In this forlorn condition, he found a friend and patron in a rich lady who supported him for a while, in company with a certain heretic whom she had adopted as her son. This man, it seems, was in high repute at Alexandria for his learning and eloquence, and was listened to by multitudes of sound Christians as well as others. But Origen, though thus associated with him under the same roof, would have no communion with him in prayer, notwithstanding the risk of thus displeasing their mutual friend and patroness.

Having obtained some skill in grammar and Greek learning, he soon supported himself by teaching ; and not long after, was put in charge of the catechetical school, now become vacant, (A. D. 203,) at the early age of seventeen. Soon finding that he could not attend to the teaching of both his former scholars and the new charge assigned him, he dismissed his grammar school, and devoted himself, with almost incredible assiduity, to his catechetic vocation. No labor and no self-denial were too great for him. He hardened himself, by sleeping on the ground instead of a bed ; wore no shoes ; dressed himself in the plainest manner ; and lived on the most scanty and simple fare. And even for these, he would not be beholden to his friends nor his scholars, but sold his books and lived on the proceeds at the rate of four *oboli*, (about seven cents,) a day.

His love and zeal for the martyrs remained still unabated, and he continued to visit, exhort, and comfort them. From the position he now so fearlessly occupied alone at the head of the christian seminary, (his superiors having fled,) and from the support he still afforded to the martyrs, how manifest are his courage, his constancy, and his devotion to the sacred cause. Here was a signal instance of that faith which shone preeminently as

the cardinal grace of the early Christians. To him was applied, according to Eusebius, the common saying, "As was his doctrine, such was his manner of life; and as his life, such was his doctrine." As he inculcated temperance, frugality, selfdenial, diligence, and a readiness to suffer martyrdom; so he exhibited all these graces, if possible, even to excess. Several of his scholars, both male and female, evinced on the spot the deep root which his instructions took in their hearts, by manfully suffering death. Some were beheaded and others burnt. Eusebius mentions six of these cases, some of whom were just learning the rudiments of Christianity. While accompanying one of them, by the name of Plutarch, till his last hour, he again very narrowly escaped destruction at the hands of the mob, who charged him with being the occasion of the death of their fellow-citizen. Regarding him as the ringleader in the cause, and his school as the fountain of this hated doctrine, they often surrounded his house, and thus compelled him to remove with his school from one house to another, to escape their violence. Still he was thronged with pupils; and proselytes were multiplied.

From the above notices, it is plain that he taught all who resorted to him for sacred knowledge, and did not confine himself merely to theological students. We have hence a further proof of his genuine and ardent zeal in the holy cause.¹

To this trying period, are generally referred the facts mentioned in a passage by Epiphanius,² as cited by Cave and Guerike, where it is said, that he was dragged up and down the city, reviled and reproached, and treated with insolent scorn and fury. Once after they had shaved his head, (in the manner of an Egyptian priest,) the Greeks placed him on the steps of the temple of Serapis, and commanded him to give branches of palm trees to such as went up to worship the idol, as was the custom of the priests. But he, taking the branches, with a bold and unhesitating mind, cried aloud, "Come, take the branch, not of the idol, but of Christ."

If they in fact carried their abuse to this pitch, and then received from him such a refusal of compliance, and such a bold and public insult to their god, it seems strange that they did not dispatch him at once; and hence some have doubted the facts.

¹ See Euseb. VI. 1—4.

² Ep. Haer. LXIV. 1. Guer. I. p. 46.

But perhaps his talents and learning commanded such respect among the philosophers ; and his sanctity, among a great portion of the people, that it was not deemed prudent to put him to death. His very courage, too, may have inspired them with awe.

He shrunk from no danger or suffering or self-denial ; that appeared to him to lie in the path of duty. In addition to the facts already mentioned in support of this position, he gave a signal proof of the same thing, by literally following his too literal interpretation of the language in Matt. 19: 12, where Christ speaks of " some who made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." This is called " his bold act." It is suggested that he had prudential reasons at this time for complying with the supposed direction, viz. that he might avert the calumny as well as avoid the temptations arising from his intercourse with female pupils. It is rather singular, that a mind so prone to figurative interpretation, should here adopt the literal sense. We have, however, to remark, that he subsequently in his commentaries gave a different and quite a figurative interpretation to the passage ; and possibly this signal mistake of his youth, may have operated as a powerful cause in subsequent life, to impel his native propensity to allegory to overleap all rational boundaries.

From these prompt and thorough acts of self-denial, we see the ardent temperament of the man, his readiness to obey the severest dictates of conscience, and perhaps we may add, with Milner, his propensity to self-righteousness.

His diligence like that of every true scholar, was as signal as his spirit of self-denial. While he abstained from wine and all delicacies, and fasted much, slept on the ground and wore no shoes, nor would have " two coats," he also spent a great part of the night in the assiduous study of the Scriptures. By these means, he commanded the respect of both the learned and the unlearned in an age and country where such a mode of life was held in the highest repute, both by Christians and heathen : and thus, in connection with his public and private instruction, he made a multitude of converts from all ranks of pagans.

About the year 211, or a little after, he went to Rome to visit the ancient church there ; but soon returned. Applying himself with fresh vigor to his school and to the study and explanation of the Scriptures, he found his burdens too great, and

therefore appointed Heraclas as his assistant, to take charge of the inferior portion of his scholars, perhaps in A. D. 213.

About this time, he learnt Hebrew; and made the celebrated collection of the original and the translations of the Old Testament, which he called Hexapla.¹ It consisted of the Hebrew text, the translations of the LXX, of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and two others whose names were unknown and which were found "in obscure corners." These he divided into verses and arranged, side by side, in distinct columns, for the purpose of comparison. This is the first polyglot of which we have any notice, and must have been of great use to his school in exciting and facilitating their study of the Old Testament. Perhaps, too, it served to increase the propensity already apparent, to a disproportionate attention to the Old Testament compared with the New.

Not far from this period, he seems to have been very successful in converting heretics and others, as appears from a passage in Eusebius. As this short chapter of the ancient historian is replete with information, I will give it entire.² "At this time, Ambrose, who favored the Valentinian heresy, being convinced by the truth preached by Origen, and having his mind cleared as it were with light, assents to the doctrine of the orthodox faith of the church. And Origen's fame being noised abroad every where, several men of great learning flocked to him, intending to make trial of this man's sufficiency in the Scriptures. Also infinite multitudes of heretics, and not a few philosophers, and those the most famous, gave diligent attention to him, almost like scholars learning from him, besides divinity, those things which appertain to external philosophy; for he initiated those, whom he perceived to have acute parts, in philosophical learning; teaching them geometry and arithmetic and the other previous sciences: also guiding them into the knowledge of the various sects among philosophers; explaining the writings that are among them, and commenting on and searching into all things. So that even among the Gentiles, this man was openly declared to be a great philosopher. He also incited many of meaner capacities to the study of the liberal sciences: telling them that from hence would accrue to

¹ Euseb. VI. 16.

² B. VI. c. 18.

them no small fitness and preparation for the contemplation of the divine Scriptures: for which reason he esteemed the study of secular and philosophical literature most necessary for himself." In the next chapter, Eusebius goes on to speak of the great fame of Origen among the heathen philosophers of the age, and affirms that some dedicated their books to him and sought his criticisms on their works. Here, too, he adduces what Porphyry says of Origen; and among other things, his affirmation, that Origen, whom he saw in his youth, was a hearer of Ammonius Saccas, and profited much in philosophy from his master. It appears from Jerome,¹ that Origen made himself acquainted with all the sects of philosophers, with geometry, music, rhetoric, etc. that he might allure crowds about him to whom he might teach the christian faith in connexion with these studies. The motive was certainly good, and the plan it would seem, successful.

In more respects than one, it was much to the benefit of Origen, that he succeed in converting from heresy the above named Ambrose, whom the reader will not confound with St. Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, and who lived in the fourth century. Being a wealthy citizen of Alexandria and a devoted friend to learning and to Origen, Ambrose did much to excite and to aid him in writing commentaries and other works. Eusebius thus speaks of his aid. "About this time Origen began to write commentaries on the Scriptures, Ambrose chiefly inciting him to it by innumerable instigations, not with supplications and bare words only, but also with most plentiful supplies of all things necessary; for there were always by him when he dictated, more than seven amanuenses which changed courses with each other. Neither was there a less number to take these notes and write them out in a fair hand, together with girls who had been instructed to write neatly and handsomely. All these Ambrose liberally supported. And indeed he conveyed into Origen an unspeakable alacrity in his study and labor about the divine oracles," conversing with him upon them at their meals, and in their walks.² It was Ambrose that also excited Origen to write his treatise against Celsus, as appears from Origen's preface to that work.

About this time, is placed the short missionary visit to Arabia, which Origen undertook at the special request of the gov-

¹ Catal. c. 54.

² See Euseb. VI. 23. Cave, p. 221.

error of that country, as before noticed. The fact of his being expressly named by the governor of Arabia as the person whom he wished the bishop to send to teach him the christian doctrine, is a striking proof of his wide-spread reputation at that rather early period of his public life.

Soon after his return to Alexandria, he was compelled by the civil commotions that arose in Egypt, to flee to Palestine. This was probably at the time when Caracalla ravaged the city of Alexandria for the insult they had offered him, and which took place some time before the assassination of that tyrant in A. D. 217. Origen took up his abode in Caesarea, where, on the solicitation of the bishops in that region, he preached and publicly expounded the Scriptures, though not yet ordained a presbyter. This gave great offence to Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, who wrote a letter of remonstrance to these bishops, complaining of it as an unheard-of thing, that a layman should preach in the presence of a bishop. To this, the bishops of Jerusalem and Caesarea replied by citing other instances in which bishops had invited laymen to do the same, "when found competent to edify the brethren."¹—From this it is manifest, that the practice of licensing fit candidates for the ministry to preach before ordination, is no modern invention. It should, however, be noted, that no precedent is here afforded for the preaching of those who are not thus approved as "competent" by men already in the sacred office.

At the solicitation of Demetrius, Origen soon returned to the duties of his school. From this period, Eusebius is less minute in his account of this catechist.

Under the reign of the excellent prince Alexander Severus, which commenced in A. D. 222, Mammaea, the pious mother of the emperor, then at Antioch, sent for Origen. He came, escorted by soldiers ordered for that purpose; and having tarried for a while, and satisfied her great curiosity to see a man who had become so famous, and having imparted much instruction, he returned.² How he bore this flattering compliment from the empress mother, or how faithful he was in employing to the best advantage this signal opportunity for doing good, which his fame and Divine Providence had thrown in his way, we know not.

At a subsequent period, probably A. D. 228, he was called to

¹ Euseb. VI. 19.

² Euseb. VI. 21.

withstand the heretics in Achaia. While passing through Palestine, he was ordained a presbyter by the same bishops who had invited him to preach at a former period, viz. Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Cæsarea. This gave mortal offence to Demetrius, who considered himself as the only person who had a right to ordain a man that belonged to his own diocese; and thenceforward he became the implacable enemy and persecutor of Origen. As a remarkable proof at once of his passion and his inconsistency, it is proper here to notice the fact, that Demetrius now urged against Origen the very same "bold act" which himself had commended at the time of its performance. Eusebius, with great appearance of justice, charges the opposition of Demetrius to the account of envy, as he does also the conduct of those who united with him to oppress Origen. Demetrius sent letters to most of the principal bishops, complaining of Origen and of the bishops who ordained him; and succeeded for a while in turning the tide against him. He also called two councils, in quick succession, one of which banished Origen from the church of Alexandria, and the other deposed him from the office of presbyter. The bishop of Rome was also induced to call a council, which decided against Origen.¹ Still, amid this rising of general opposition, many of the bishops of Palestine and the East, remained the firm defenders of the persecuted catechist. This may be accounted for, in part, from the fact, that no small number of these bishops had been educated in the same school, and were thus prepared to side with him in doctrine and action.

We may rationally inquire, with some surprise, why such a man as Origen should not have been ordained in good season by his own bishop? The true answer is doubtless to be sought in the corrupt source already mentioned, viz. the envy of the bishop. This we may suppose the only reason, unless we add a suspicion respecting the soundness of his doctrines, of which there seems at this time no adequate evidence. We may regard the interposition of the bishops of Palestine, in this office, as a proof either of their opposition to Demetrius in general, or of their candid opinion that Origen was unreasonably kept back from the sacred office.

¹ Euseb. VI. 8. Cave, p. 224. Guer. I. p. 52.

Having already taken part with him in first permitting him to preach while a layman, and in subsequently ordaining him as presbyter, they were now prepared to afford him an asylum in the day of distress. Accordingly, on leaving the ungrateful city and the dominion of the proud bishop, he retired to Cæsarea A. D. 232. The school was now left to the sole care of his assistant Heraclas.

In a short time after this, however, Demetrius died ; and Heraclas, the friend and successor of Origen, was transferred from the school to the episcopal chair of Alexandria. Upon this change, the clerical persecution against Origen ceased ; and it would seem probable that he might have returned to the charge of his beloved school at Alexandria, had he been so disposed. Why he did not do this, we are left only to conjecture. Perhaps it would appear unseemly in his view and that of his friends, for him to hold a subordinate office under the new bishop, who, though his friend, was his inferior in talents, and had so recently been his pupil and his usher. There might also be still a degree of hostility towards Origen among a portion of the Egyptian clergy, who had so lately deposed him, which would mar his comfort and impede his usefulness. These considerations, in connexion with the profound respect and cordial welcome with which he found himself greeted on his arrival in Palestine, might well induce him to prefer a residence in that sacred abode, where Christianity was first promulgated by the Savior himself.

But wherever he might be, it was not for him to remain inactive, or to refrain from the work of teaching students in divinity and reclaiming or confronting heretics. Accordingly we soon find him busy in a new school which he opened at Cæsarea. Here he continued his commentaries, and wrote his book on martyrdom, and other works. Great multitudes flocked around him, "myriads," as Eusebius expresses it, "not only of that country but from other regions, who left their homes to enjoy his instruction. Among the most celebrated of these, were Gregory Thaumaturgus and his brother Athenodorus, who spent five years in his school, and whom he persuaded to give up their former pursuit of profane literature for that of divinity. At the end of five years, these young men were judged to be qualified to take the charge of churches, which they did in Pontus. From the fact that these distinguished scholars, who were before acquainted with Greek and Roman literature, spent *five* years

under Origen, we may infer that he was in favor of a thorough course of study for those who were to preach the gospel, and no friend to a superficial and scanty preparation. The bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, came and spent some time with him, and also invited him into his diocese to instruct the churches. Eusebius also affirms, that the bishops of Jerusalem and Cæsarea "were at all times attentive to him as if he had been their own master, and would suffer no one else to expound the Scriptures and to perform all other things pertaining to ecclesiastic doctrine."¹

During his residence at Cæsarea, he was frequently called abroad to meet heretics and to attend councils. At two different times, in the course of this period, he went into Arabia. On the first of these occasions, he went for the express purpose of reclaiming Baryllus, bishop of Bostria, who had fallen into the error of denying the divinity and the preëxistence of Christ. He first confuted him, and then took the heretic by the hand and completely reclaimed him. In connexion with this story, Eusebius declares that there were innumerable accounts which had been handed down to his time, of the achievements of Origen.² The other occasion on which he was sent for into Arabia, was when a council assembled there on account of a sect of materialists, who had risen up and who affirmed that the soul perishes with the body, but will be resuscitated with the body at the resurrection.² Here he again managed so well as not only to confute, but also completely to reclaim the heretics on the spot. How admirable this! From the frequent instances of such success which are recorded of Origen, and from the hint just cited from Eusebius of innumerable other instances of his achievements, as it would seem, of the same sort, are we not led to as great an admiration of his tact and his christian urbanity, as of his masterly powers and consummate erudition? Happy would it have been for the church in succeeding ages, and down to the present day, had his example in this matter been as closely and extensively followed, as it was in the figurative and fanciful interpretation of those Scriptures which every where enjoin the same spirit of mingled zeal and love. He that kindly reclaims, while he soundly refutes, one heresiarch, performs a much better service to the church and to God, than the orthodox champion

¹ Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VI. 26. 30. 28.

² Euseb. VI. 33. 37.

who refutes indeed a whole brood of the corrupt progeny, but instead of reclaiming, only makes them twofold more the sons of error by his needless severity. He is also the greater man ; for " he has ruled his own spirit," while he has also more effectually " taken the city."

May I not also here hazard another remark on what appears as so rare a combination of ardor and suavity in this truly great man? Was it not in part owing to this admirable trait, that his persecutors spared his life on so many occasions, when they slew others that had done far less for the promotion of that Christianity which they were seeking to exterminate?

During this period, he also made a journey to Athens, where he staid for a while and pursued the composition of his works.

Amid his other labors, he found time for writing many letters, of which Eusebius made a large collection in his time. Some of these were to distinguished persons, as the emperor Philip and his wife.

During the persecution under the monster Maximin, he composed his work on martyrdom, and is said to have suffered much himself; and perhaps it was at this time, (A.D. 235,) that he remained for two years in retirement, supported by Juliana, a lady of distinction. Again, in the persecution under Decius, about A. D. 250, when advanced in age, he suffered still more severely. He was thrown into prison, chained, his legs cruelly distended in the stocks, and himself threatened with fire by his persecutors. Still, the governor commanded that he should not be killed ; and he probably survived, in an enfeebled state, for some time after. In this persecution, his old friend and supporter, Alexander of Jerusalem, perished in prison.

As to the time and circumstances of the death of Origen, there is much dispute among the ancients as well as the moderns. He probably died at Tyre, at the age of 69, and in the year 254. His last years were spent in writing letters and doing good in other ways, as he found himself able amid the infirmities of age and the decrepitude occasioned by his sufferings in the recent persecution, and the unparalleled labors of his eventful life.

Thus lived and died one of the greatest moral prodigies of the human race. The estimate of his character and writings has been very different in different countries, and at different periods, and by different individuals. He is, however, univer-

¹ Euseb. VI. 36. 28. 39.

sally regarded as one of the most laborious and efficient and learned scholars that have appeared. He has also been highly revered for his conscientious regard to duty and his unflinching self denial and readiness to meet every danger. In view of the above characteristics, the ancients denominated him *Adamantius*, the man of adamant.

He was early accused of a heretical tendency in his writings. It is said, however, that Athenasius, that able and thorough advocate of orthodoxy in the fourth century, complained of nothing in his writings except on the subject of future punishment, and that he quoted Origen as holding to what was subsequently expressed in the Nicene creed on the subject of Christ's divinity.¹ Still, there is much in his writings which has been generally condemned, not only as hasty and rash in speculation, but as obviously false. His apologists, of whom he has always had a large number, allege that his writings have been greatly corrupted; an evil of which himself found occasion to complain from some heretics during his life time. It is also said, that some passages in which he states only the sentiments of those whom he is opposing, have been falsely understood as expressing his own views. It is to be remembered, too, that near the close of his life, while in Palestine, he permitted stenographers to take notes of his extempore discourses; ² and in these there may have been much misrepresentation, as Whitefield since found to be the fact in his case. After all, there is no doubt of the sinister tendency of much that is found in his writings, as we may have some occasion to see in the second part of this treatise. The church were brought to brand him as a heretic in a subsequent age; and the Greeks especially still regard him with abhorrence. One thing appears to be generally acknowledged, viz. that *he every where shows a disposition to accommodate christian doctrines to heathen philosophy*, and to make the difference appear as small as possible. This we must regard as a deplorable trait in a christian teacher, and peculiarly in one who was to form so extensively the teachers of religion in his own and subsequent ages. How much of that tide of speculative heathenism, which actually though covertly came in upon the church, is to be laid to his charge as the occasion, we know not. Still we may suppose that he considered this accommodating spirit as the best and the kindest way of making proselytes from among the heathen philosophers.

¹ Cave, p. 237.

² Euseb. VI. 36.

But we must remember, in mitigation of our censure, that he could not then have the monitory benefit that has since accrued from the baleful experience of the church, resulting from an erroneous system of first aiming at only half-way conversions from heathenism or open sin, in the fallacious hope that such converts would afterwards become more perfect. Into this error Origen doubtless fell; and falling, contributed prodigiously to swell the desolating tide that overwhelmed the church in virtual heathenism for a thousand years. The lesson which the evangelical church now derives on this subject of *thorough conversions*, is among the very best we can gain from that millennium of darkness and corruption. The same baleful principle in its final results, may have influenced Origen in regard to heretics. While so successful in reclaiming these wanderers, his success and the suavity of his feelings may have led him to impart a coloring to many of his exhibitions of doctrine, for the purpose of conciliation, which proved very unwise in the more general results to his own character and usefulness, and to the good of the church.

As to the charge of real heresy, one further item of apology is made for him by his friends, viz. that many things which are adduced against him from his writings, are things which he only stated for *consideration*, and not as articles of his settled belief; and that he retracted, in the latter part of his life, many sentiments which he had avowed at an earlier period.

His works were almost incredibly numerous. Epiphanius says, they were estimated at no less than 6,000 volumes. This, however, would doubtless include each letter and little tract or sermon, as a distinct volume or roll. Still, the number was regarded by many of the ancients, as greatly overrated by Epiphanius; but many were ready to admit that Origen had written too much for one man to read. We are here to remember the story of the seven amanuenses whom he kept at work, and that he wrote in a diffuse style, though in many respects a good one. It is said that he commented on all parts of the Bible, except the Apocalypse. His writings were generally filled with a devotional spirit. A great part of his works are lost, though much still remains, especially of his commentaries and his writings against heretics and heathen, as Celsus, etc.¹

¹ See Cave's life of him.

On the whole, we may consider him as having accomplished immense good, and as being the undesigned occasion of much evil. He gave great renown to the christian name among the heathen literati, and did much to elevate the standard of knowledge and to encourage the rigid practice of what were regarded as the christian graces. His fame and influence will endure to the end of time. He has left an illustrious example of christian diligence, connected, as it commonly is, with the strictest temperance. We have seen how scrupulously he abstained from wine and all sensual gratifications ; and his example, in this particular, is now helping in the grandest revolution that is stamping for future fame our own most revolutionary age.

In conclusion, I remark, that Origen is one among the few who have graced the annals of our race, by standing up as a living definition of what is meant by a man of genius, learning, piety, and energy. All these he possessed in admirable combination. Any subject that was worth mastering, he would master ; and when he had done it, would devote the acquisition to the specific purpose for which he sought it. Thus he learnt music, philosophy, and heathen literature, that he might gain the esteem and win the souls of the devotees to such accomplishments. Thus he studied Hebrew, that he might interpret the Scriptures and meet the Jews ; and then he wrote commentaries without end. He pursued nothing without a design. The soul of man was his great object ; the world was his theatre ; it was to his purpose to make himself at home every where and in all things, that he might gain all men. Like the great apostle, we find him every where true to his purpose and prepared for his work ;—at Alexandria, in the school and amid its philosophers and multifarious population ; in Arabia, in Palestine, in Athens ; among Christians and among heathen ; among persecutors and heretics, as well as among friends. It was worse than in vain for opposition to do any thing to such a man, short of putting him to death. Drag him, half dead, to the heathen temple, and bid him distribute the emblems of heathen rites, and you hear him preaching Jesus to those who approach to grasp the sacred branches. Let Demetrius and his councils expel and depose him ; and he does but retire to Cæsarea, where he opens a new school of *greater* numbers, and “myriads” throng around him. Here is the stamp of a truly great and good man. Crucified to the world in his youth, and the world to him, there remained nothing for the world to do, ex-

cept to kill him,—and even this he courted, instead of dreading. He wished for no excuse to cease from his christian toils ; they were his meat and drink.

With all this positive excellence, what a pity that we find so much to regret in the imaginative bias and the philosophizing direction of his mighty mind. But though he was greatly imperfect, and though he marred beyond bounds his future usefulness by his visionary interpretations of the Bible, and by his scholastic speculations, and perhaps has even been the occasion of more hurt than good ; still I cannot find it in my heart, nor do I meet with evidence from abroad to compel me, to subscribe to Milner's reiterated censure of this great man on the score of *pride*—reasoning *pride*. Positiveness, in a man of such vision and such strength of feeling, is not necessarily the offspring and proof of pride. It *may* spring from a resistless impulse in the cause of truth.

HERACLAS.

We now proceed to a respectable, though quite an inferior personage compared with the mighty and original mind we have just contemplated at such length. There is, however, this consolation in the case, that we can despatch his story in very few words ; especially as a part of it has been already anticipated.

Heraclas, while a presbyter, had been appointed by Origen to the care of the inferior department of the school, about the year 213, in which capacity he served till the time of Origen's banishment (232), when he succeeded to the sole charge of the institution. In this he continued for about a year ; when, on the death of the envious and persecuting Demetrius, he was called to succeed him in the episcopal chair of Alexandria. His labors in the school as usher were therefore long, and doubtless faithful and beneficial, being no less than nineteen years. He must of course have been perfectly familiar with the routine of duties and the general management in the school ; and had he not been promoted to another office, he might have continued to manage the affairs of the seminary, with discretion and profit, beyond the brief term of one year.

He and his brother Plutarch, of whom I have before spoken as having suffered martyrdom, were both converted from heathenism by Origen, at that memorable period when Origen was left in his youth with the sole charge of the school. Heraclas is very highly commended by Eusebius, Nicephorus, and others,

especially for his knowledge of philosophy and profane literature. Eusebius affirms, that it was on account of his attainments of this kind, that he was made bishop. He also commends him for his studious attention to divinity; and asserts that his fame was so great as to attract Julius Africanus to Alexandria, to see him.

He continued in his bishopric for sixteen years, when he died, A. D. 248. He left no writings behind him of which we have any knowledge.¹

When we see such a man as Origen expelled from Alexandria, and one so greatly his inferior soon raised to the bishop's throne, we are forcibly reminded of the emphatic and taunting complaint of bishop Watson, with respect to the sort of men who are most likely to reach the highest seats of promotion in the established church of even his own enlightened and generous island—'men of not the first stamp for either knowledge, independence, or piety.' Still it is possible, that Heraclas possessed a degree of prudence, common sense, and tact for business and government, which were not found in Origen.

DIONYSIUS.

The next whom we find at the head of this school of the prophets is Dionysius. He was born, as is supposed, of reputable parents at Alexandria, and there enjoyed wealth and honors previous to his conversion to Christianity.² The time and circumstances of his conversion, are not related; but he was one of Origen's distinguished scholars; and subsequently, a man of considerable fame in the church.

On the removal of Heraclas from the office of catechist to that of bishop, Dionysius succeeded in the charge of the school, A. D. 233. Here he continued till the death of Heraclas, when he succeeded him again, in the higher office of bishop, in the church of Alexandria, A. D. 248. It is not, however, generally supposed that he now relinquished, like his predecessor, the duties of the school; but that he continued at the head of it till his death, A. D. 265.

Like Origen, he read the works of heretics; and when he

¹ Guer. I. p. 64 sq. Euseb. VI. 3. 31. 35. 26. Niceph. V. 26.

² Cave's life of him, p. 284.

felt their defiling influence on his mind, and was expostulated with by his friend, and was about to lay them aside; a voice from God directed him, as he states, to proceed and read every thing which should come to his hands; as this was the way in which he became a Christian, and as he was able to search into every thing.¹

During the persecution under Decius, A. D. 249, the church at Alexandria, as before, suffered extremely. On the arrival of the decree from the emperor, an officer was sent to apprehend Dionysius; but instead of going directly to the house of the bishop, where he was waiting in expectation of the summons, this officer spent four days in searching for him "in the highways, rivers, fields, and wherever he supposed he might be hid," not imagining that the good man could think of remaining at home when he knew inquisition was made for him. After the fourth day, in company with his servants and some christian brethren, and at the divine command, as he relates the story, he went forth; and about sunset, some soldiers met and apprehended them, and carried them to Taposiris, a small town near Alexandria. In the mean time, Timothy, a disciple of Dionysius, not knowing what had taken place, went to the house; but finding it empty, and soldiers keeping guard at the door, and that the inmates had been taken into custody, he fled in dismay. In his flight, he met a countryman who inquired the occasion of his terror, and to whom he related the facts. This man was on his way to a marriage feast, which then commonly lasted all night. The sequel I give in the words of Dionysius himself. "The countryman went his way, and coming into the house, told the story to them who were seated at the table. All of them, with unanimous earnestness, rose up together and ran with great clamors, and came speedily upon us. The soldiers who guarded us, being forthwith put to flight by them, they came upon us as we were, and found us lying upon couches without any furniture on them. I, God knows, supposing them to be thieves who came for pillage, continued lying on the couch, naked as I was, excepting only a linen garment which I had on, and offered to them my other clothes which lay by me; but they bid me rise and come out immediately. Then, understanding the cause of their coming, I cried out, entreating them to depart and let us alone; but if they intended

¹ Euseb. VII. 7.

to do me a kindness, I begged them to behead me, and thus prevent those who brought me prisoner thither. While I thus cried out, (as my companions know,) they compelled me to rise up. I threw myself on my back upon the ground ; but they took me by the hands and feet, and dragged me out. Those who are my witnesses in these things, followed me, viz. Caius, Faustus, Peter, and Paul, who took me with the couch on their shoulders, and conveyed me out of the village, and having set me upon an ass unsaddled, they carried me away." Retiring then into a desert part of Lybia, they remained concealed till the persecution was over.¹

Upon the death of Decius, A. D. 251, Dionysius returned to his church, which he found in a most distracted state, many having relapsed during the persecution.¹ Some of the relapsed now desired readmission to the church, which occasioned great disputes, as many were at this period adverse to such readmissions. Dionysius was in favor of receiving all who gave evidence of penitence, and did much by his writings to mitigate this extreme severity of the Novatians. His whole character was as strongly marked for kindness, as for true courage and piety. He, however, moderately sided with Cyprian in another dispute of that period, and required the re-baptism of such as had been baptized by heretics. It was not long before his christian fortitude was again put to the fiery ordeal of persecution. Valerian, whom he plausibly regarded as the beast of the Apocalypse, commissioned the governor of Alexandria to institute a brutal assault upon the Christians, A. D. 257. When required by the governor to worship the gods, in hope that his flock would follow the example of their bishop, he replied, that he must obey God rather than man ; and when neither exhortations nor threats were of any avail, Aemilius banished him to Cephro, the rudest part of the Lybian desert, and exposed to the depredations of thieves and robbers. He was hurried away, without a day's respite to recover from a sickness then upon him. Hither he was followed by many Christians from Alexandria ; and here, too, he preached the gospel, and with such success, to the rude heathen, that he began to turn the desert into a fruitful field. Orders were sent, from time to time, removing him from one place to another. But wherev-

¹ Euseb. VI. 40. VII. 11. Cave, p. 287.

er he was carried, he was as successful as he was faithful in his great work.¹

How vain it was to attempt to stop the mouth or break the spirit of this great and good man ; or to stop the progress of the gospel which he preached ! So let one, at any time, but preach the gospel in the genuine spirit of a *martyr*, "*ready to be offered*," and robbers themselves will repent and join him, even in the face of the most cruel persecution.

In the mean time the havoc went on at Alexandria, till that brutal emperor was taken by Sapor, the Persian king, and, as he well deserved, was flayed alive.

Dionysius then returned (A. D. 260) ; but soon found himself amid the greatest difficulties, from the civil commotions, the plague, and the famine which ensued. In a letter to Hierax, an Egyptian bishop, he gives a most frightful account of the peril and desolation around him. Speaking of the effects of the civil war, in which the brethren were divided against each other, as well as the heathen, he says, that it was almost impossible to hold communication with any one in the city, or under his own roof, even by letters ; and that the middle street was, if possible, more unfrequented than the desert through which the Israelites passed ; and that it was safer to travel not only beyond the bounds of Egypt, but from the *East*, to the *West*, than to traverse Alexandria. Sometimes the branch of the Nile passing by the city was almost dry ; and at other times, it so overflowed its banks as to cover the fields and threaten a second deluge. It was also red with the blood and filled with the putrifying bodies of the slain. The air was defiled with most noisome exhalations. "Such vapors," says he, "arise from the earth, such winds from the sea, such blasts from the rivers, and such mists from the heavens, that the very dews are nothing else but the gore of dead carcasses, putrified in all the subjacent elements." These waters of death, filling the aqueducts that led from the Nile under every part of the city, greatly increased the pestilence. On the extent of the desolation, he adds : "This great city does not contain in it so many inhabitants, should they be numbered from infants to the most aged, as it formerly maintained lively old men ; and our youngest men now look as if they were of the same age with our old men formerly." The heathen regarded these calamities as intolerable ; but the Christians found them nothing more than

¹ Euseb. VII. 11.

what they before suffered from the hand of violence, and they bore them with fortitude.

A striking contrast is here presented of the different feelings of the two parties amid these calamities. The Christians neglected themselves in their care for the brethren, disregarding the contagion into which they fearlessly rushed. "They took the dead bodies of the saints up in their open hands and into their bosoms, they closed their eyes and shut their mouths, carried them upon their shoulders, and buried them; they stuck close to them, embraced them, washed them, and adorned them curiously in their clothes. Not long after, they had the like good offices performed for themselves. But the Gentile practice was quite contrary to this. They thrust out of doors those who began to be infected; they fled away from those most dear to them; they deserted them, half dead, in the high ways, and cast forth the dead bodies unburied."¹

It is deeply to be regretted, that we have only a few extracts from these descriptive letters, preserved to us. Had he written a full history of that eventful period of the church in Egypt, it must have been an inestimable treasure.

In addition to the discussions about the re-baptism of heretics and the readmission of the lapsed, in which he advocated moderation, we have to subjoin, that Dionysius took a much more zealous part against the Sabellians; whose doctrine he opposed with all his might, and even fell into the opposite extreme of separating too much the persons of the Trinity, and incurred the charge of heresy by some. By going to this extreme, he doubtless contributed to lay the foundation for Arianism, which afterwards sprung up. Dionysius also assailed and put down the *chiliasts* in Egypt. Near the close of his life, he was invited to the council at Antioch, to oppose Paul of Samosata, the first humanitarian, but was too infirm to attend it. He died A. D. 265, in the seventeenth year of his episcopate.

Amid the duties of his episcopal office and the troubles from persecution, war, pestilence, famine, and heresies, it was impossible he should have much time to devote to the school. But as we know of no other who presided over it from the time of his elevation to his death, we are left to conclude, that it was either under his instruction during this period, or else suspended in part if not entirely.²

¹ Euseb. VII. 21. 22.

² Niceph. VI. 25. 21. 28. Euseb. VII. 26. 24. 28.

His writings were numerous and highly valued. Among them were four books against Sabellius; two against Nepos, the chiliast; many epistles, and some commentaries. Most of his works are lost.

From this period, the authority of Eusebius fails us, as to the series of teachers in this school; and considerable disputes have arisen as to several of the subsequent catechists, some authors making them more, and others less in number. Philip Sidetes is the only historian of antiquity who has left us a catalogue of them; and his authority is principally followed by Guericke, apparently with good reason. I shall therefore adopt the same; but need not stand to assign the reasons for excluding from the number of catechists several names which Hospinian, the Magdeburg centuriators, and others, have proposed to insert. Nor shall I spend time in rehearsing the evidence for the precise date and duration of each man's labors, as given in the synoptical view already presented.

PIERIUS.

He is supposed to have taken charge of the school at the death of Dionysius, (A. D. 265,) when it was probably in a low state from the causes just related. He was distinguished for his philosophic skill, his logic, his power as a preacher and interpreter of the Scriptures, and for his voluntary poverty and ascetic mode of life. For such qualities as these, he was called *Origen Junior*, and was regarded as the most learned man of his age at Alexandria. He was one of Origen's scholars. After the year 282, he is supposed to have left the school. The latter part of his life was spent at Rome.

He wrote twelve books of commentary, and other works, in a very neat style; but they have not come down to us. He also afforded great assistance to Origen in his critical labors, especially on the Septuagint. Of his birth and death, we know nothing certain.¹

ACHILLAS.

This man appears to have been the associate and assistant of Pierius for the latter part of the time, and to have continued

¹ Euseb. VII. 32. Niceph. VI. 35.

in this capacity under his successor. Eusebius speaks of Achilles as being made presbyter at the same time with Pierius, and as being a man of excellent life and sublime philosophy; and affirms that he had charge of the sacred school.¹

THEOGNOSTUS.

He is supposed to have succeeded Pierius in the catechetical office from A. D. 282 to 290. The evidence of this, however, is very slight, except that he is here inserted in Philip's catalogue. But very little, in fact, is known of the man, except that he wrote seven books of *hypotyposes*, or *sketches* of a system of religious truth,—perhaps like Origen's *principia*, both in matter and manner, as he was a friend to Origen's views, if not a disciple of his. He was accused by Photius of heretical views respecting the Trinity, but has been defended by bishop Bull. An abstract of his chief work is preserved by Photius. He wrote also on blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.²

SERAPION.

This name next occurs in the catalogue of Philip. Several of the same name are found in the early records of the church. We know but very little of the individual on whom Guerike fixes to fill this gap, except that he flourished at Alexandria about this period, and *may* therefore have discharged the duties of catechist from about A. D. 290 to 295. But whether he actually did occupy this station, or, if he did, how long was his term of service, it is neither easy nor important to determine.—We pass him by, and proceed to a somewhat more conspicuous personage.

PETER MARTYR.

He probably had the care of the school from 295 to 312, when he was beheaded as a conspicuous and faithful martyr. In the year 300, he was made bishop of Alexandria.

Eusebius speaks of him in language of the highest commendation, as a "most eminent prelate of the Alexandrian church, the chief ornament and glory of the bishops, both for his virtuous life and his study and knowledge of the Scriptures." The first three years of his episcopate were passed in peace; but on

¹ Euseb. VII. 32. Niceph. VI. 35.

² See Guer. I. p. 78. Mosheim's Ecc. Hist. II. pp. 214. 222.

the breaking out of the last and most dreadful of the heathen persecutions, under Diocletian, (A. D. 303,) he was apprehended and cast into prison. From this period, he became very ascetic in his life. He was suddenly and unexpectedly put to death, by order of Maximin, A. D. 312.

Epiphanius gives an account of a controversy between Peter and Meletius respecting episcopal jurisdiction, from which it would seem that Peter was disposed to extend and maintain, with a high hand, his prerogative of ordaining presbyters. It is, however, to be remembered that Epiphanius derived his materials for this account from "the doubtful, if not fictitious, acts of the Meletians."

The writings which remain from the pen of this father, consist of fragments from a work on penance, and some other small productions.¹

ARIUS.

This heretic stands next in the list as presented by Guerike, from A. D. 313 to 320. The authority for this, however, is but slight, as even Philip Sidetes has not inserted his name, nor do Socrates, Sozomen, or Photius mention him as one of these teachers, though treating largely of the man and of his heresy. The evidence in proof of his having sustained the office, rests in part upon the assertion of Theodoret, that Arius "was entrusted with the exegesis of the scriptures," τὴν δὲ τῶν θειῶν γραφῶν πεπιστευμένος ἐξήγησιν. This is considered as indicating, in the current language of the time, a different office from that of pastoral instruction in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and agrees perfectly with the duties of an Alexandrian catechist. And as Arius was then a presbyter at Alexandria, and the school left without any other teacher of whom we have any account, for twenty years after the death of Peter, the inference is, that Arius was called to act in this capacity for a portion of that time. To this, it is objected by Michaelis, that if he had been a catechist, we should have had an account of his deposition from this office as well as from that of presbyter. But it is urged in reply, that none but those belonging to the sacred office, had a right to give such exegetical instruction; and of course Arius *was* virtually deposed from the office in the school

¹ Euseb. VII. 32. IX. 6. Niceph. VI. 34. Mosheim's Ecc. Hist. I. pp. 289. 322. Guer. I. p. 81. Epiph. 68. 3.

by being deprived of his office as presbyter.—But I may be permitted here to remark, that if this was so, the regulations must have been changed subsequently to the time of Origen, who was a teacher for several years *before* he was presbyter. I have seen no account of such a change, and Guerike adduces none. I may add, also, that if the school was only a *private* establishment, as I have supposed, there would be no occasion for any *deposition* from it.

In further confirmation of his opinion, Guerike cites Patricius Ararsius as confirming this interpretation of the language of Theodoret; and he further contends, that Philip Sidetes does not oppose the construction, as this historian does not affirm that Macarius, the next in his catalogue, *immediately* succeeded Peter, A. D. 312, nor could he affirm it, considering the time in which Macarius lived, which was a little subsequent, as we shall see.

Philip, as a pupil and friend of the school, might also feel a strong temptation to omit, in his catalogue of teachers, so hated a name as that of Arius had become in the time of Theodosius the Great. It is also probable, that Arius would find but little time to devote to catechetical instruction during his contest with bishop Alexander, which began as early as A. D. 317. Hence he would make but little figure in the school; and the historians may, therefore, be the more easily pardoned for the omission of his name. One more hint on this side of the question. If we suppose Arius to have been one of the teachers, it will go to account, in some degree, for the suspension of the school, which appears to have ensued from about A. D. 320 to 330; and this consideration will be of the greater force, in proportion as we regard the institution in the light of a private, rather than a strictly public institution. In this case, it is easy to imagine the blasting influence of his defection from the faith; and how likely it would be to suspend, if not forever to destroy, its character and its operations.¹

I shall here omit all details of the life of this supposed teacher, partly because the term assigned was so short and the main fact of his office so doubtful; but chiefly, because the life of this arch heretic is already so well known by all who are conversant with the ecclesiastical history of that period.

¹ Theodoret, Ecc. Hist. I. 1. Guer. I. p. 85.

MACARIUS.

After a suspension of the school for ten years, Macarius is supposed to have revived it, about the year A. D. 330, and to have continued it to about A. D. 340.

Socrates informs us, in his account of the monks who lived in the desert, of two celebrated monks of this name, one of whom was born in Upper Egypt and wrought a multitude of miracles; the other came from Alexandria, and was of a much more affable disposition, and induced many to embrace that kind of life. It is not easy to decide which of these was the catechist, but probably the latter, who was named *Politicus*, because he came from the city.

After teaching for about ten years, he left the school and betook himself to the desert, where he followed the ascetic mode of life, and died near the close of the century, as Cave supposes, at about the age of one hundred.

He wrote a regulation for monastic life, and a discourse on the state of souls after death.¹

DIDYMUS THE BLIND.

This famous teacher comes next; concerning whom there is much less of doubt. Rufinus says of him,² that he "attained to such erudition and science in human and divine things, as to become a teacher in the ecclesiastical school." And in Sozomen, he is mentioned as "presiding in the sacred school of sacred science at Alexandria."³

He was born A. D. 309, and died A. D. 395; and presided over the school from about A. D. 340, to A. D. 395. He appears to have devoted himself entirely to the business, without being distracted, like most of the other teachers, with any other employment. Most of the ecclesiastical writers of that period, mention him; and always with great respect for his learning and diligence.

At the early age of four or five, he lost his eye-sight, when just commencing the knowledge of letters. Yet such were his talents and application, that he surpassed most men of his age in his almost miraculous acquisitions. He learnt to read with his fingers, by having the letters deeply cut in a tablet. This art of reading with the fingers, therefore, is no modern invention, though now greatly improved and systematically taught.

¹ Socrat. IV. 23. Cave, Lit. Hist. Guer. I. p. 87.

² Ecc. Hist. II. 7.

³ Sozom. III. 15.

Rufinus relates, that he mingled prayer with his studies, and gave close attention while others read to him ; and when they fell asleep after the labor of such lucubrations, he ruminated on what he had heard, and so arranged it in his memory, that "he appeared not so much to have heard what had been read, as to have written it on the pages of his mind."¹ Socrates assures us, that he readily mastered grammar ; and rhetoric, with still greater ease. Thence he proceeded, with admirable facility, to philosophy ; and learnt logic, arithmetic, and music. So skilled was he also in the Scriptures, that he published many discourses upon them, and dictated three books on the Trinity ; and interpreted Origen's *Principia*. In his comments on this work, he greatly praises it, and condemns those who censure it, as being incapable of arriving at a knowledge of Origen's perspicacity. As a further proof of his astonishing powers and acquisitions, Socrates refers us to the works of Didymus ; and proceeds in his commendations by quoting the following effusion from the monk Antoninus, on coming from the desert and ascertaining his extent of knowledge. "O Didymus," exclaims the learned monk, "let not the loss of your bodily eyes trouble you ; for you are deprived of such eyes as the flies and goats can see with ; but rejoice that you have those eyes with which angels see, by which God himself is discerned and his light comprehended." Socrates then adds, "At that time Didymus was looked upon as the greatest patron and defender of the genuine faith, who disputed against the Arians, unravelled their sophistic cavils, and confuted their adulterate and fraudulent discourses."²

He was also exceedingly renowned for his piety ; and Palladius, the credulous historian of the monks, affirms, that the death of Julian the apostate was divinely revealed to him.³

Under him the school flourished greatly ; and among his disciples are enumerated such men as Jerome, Rufinus, Palladius, Evagrius, Isidore, etc.

Although he strenuously and successfully contended against the Arian heresy, he did not himself escape the imputation of the heresy of Origenism, for which he was condemned, long after his death, by the fifth general council at Constantinople, A. D. 553 ; and subsequently, by pope Martin I.

His numerous commentaries are lost ; as are also his explana-

¹ Ruf. II. 7.

² Soc. Ecc. Hist. IV. 25.

³ Hist. Saus. c. 4. as cited by Guerike.

tions of Origen's *Principia*, and some other works. His book on the Holy Spirit, his three books on the Trinity, etc. are preserved.¹

There remains but one more on the catalogue of Alexandrian catechists, as given by Philip ; and he perhaps the least as well as the last ; since even his friend and pupil, this same Philip Sidetes, has done little more than to record his name, which is Rhodo ; and no other historian appears to have done him even that kind office.

RHODO.

In A. D. 395, he was probably assistant for a while to the venerable Didymus, then in his eighty-fourth year. On the death of this blind but distinguished catechist, the school appears to have come into the hands of Rhodo, who, according to Philip, 'removed it to the city of Side in Pamphylia, where Philip then was, about the time of Theodosius the Great,' which could not be later than A. D. 395. Though Philip thus speaks of the removal of the *school*, still Guerike supposes, that we are rather to understand him as affirming the removal of the teacher than of the school itself. His view is, that Rhodo left the sinking seminary at Alexandria, and attempted, though with but poor success, to establish a new one at Side. In the mean time, the institution at Alexandria is supposed to have become again a mere school for catechumens. The particulars on these points, and the scanty evidence on which they rest, are not of sufficient importance to deserve a rehearsal.

I may here, in conclusion of this account, be permitted again to remark, that the whole aspect of the school, at its conclusion as well as at its commencement, resembles that of a private, rather than a strictly public institution. Nothing is recorded of the disposal of its funds, its buildings, or its books ; nothing of the acts of its guardians in its last extremity. The simple record is, that "*Rhodo* removed the school to Side ;" and perhaps the rather forced construction of this record, to which we have just attended, is the result of an erroneous view as regards the *public* nature of the institution. Guerike thinks that Rhodo could not strictly have removed it, without the act of its guardians, and therefore he only removed himself. But if it was essentially a private establishment, its teacher and head might remove it where he pleased ; and we need do no violence to the

¹ See Guer. I. p. 92 sq.

simple record of the historian.—All this is still in accordance with the supposition, (if we see fit to adopt that supposition,) that it may have enjoyed the *temporary* munificence of Constantine, and other christian emperors.

The loss of character and the final decay of the school, are attributed to the contests about the doctrines of Origen, Arius, Nestorius, and the Monophysites, all of which raged with peculiar violence at Alexandria; and having to bear the accumulated sins of all its teachers, it finally sunk.¹ And so, peradventure, may one day sink some of those institutions now so thickly rising among us. Public sentiment, connected with the public exigency, alone can cause them permanently to prosper.

The *second part* of this article, containing some account of the *doctrines* taught in the Alexandrian school, may be expected in the next Number of this work.

ART. II.—ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SENSE AND THE SIGNIFICATION OF WORDS AND PHRASES.

By S. F. N. MORS, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. Translated from the Latin by J. TORREY, Professor of Languages in the University of Vermont.

It is a truth well established by experience, that every passage of any writer does not admit of being rendered word for word, as the phrase is, into another language. Nor is this true of those expressions only, which are peculiar to a language or people; as, certain names of certain things, maxims, proverbs, and those phrases which usually pass under the denomination of idioms; but a great many other passages are to be found in almost every book, which contain nothing strictly peculiar to any language, and yet do not admit of being rendered word for word, so as to express any intelligible meaning. For however men may agree in their opinions, in the nature and discipline of their minds, in

¹ Guer. l. 97. 119. Schröckh, X. p. 240 sq. XVIII. p. 493 sq.

their feelings, talents, and modes of thinking generally ; yet there is such a diversity in their manner of expressing their feelings and thoughts, that by comparing certain languages and writers, we might sometimes be almost tempted to doubt, whether men so widely differing in their mode of speaking were endowed with the same common faculties of thought and intelligence.

What we mean to affirm, when we say that every thing does not admit of being rendered word for word into another language, is simply this : *That it is not possible, in every case, to find a word in another language of precisely the same signification with that which belongs to the word in the passage we translate ;* or, that the significations, all and each, in both languages, cannot so correspond, as to admit of being perfectly matched as it were, word against word, signification against signification. Such I apprehend to be our meaning when we speak on this subject, and such we find to be the case in all the examples.

The causes of this diversity are, in part, common to entire nations, as the age, manners, state of cultivation ; in part, peculiar to individual writers, as their talents, pursuits, learning, ignorance ; all of which have been so frequently and ably handled by others, that any further discussion of them would seem to be unnecessary. But as the result of these causes it happens, that there remain in one language many traces of a rude antiquity, which others, uniformly aiming at elegance, have entirely polished away ; and others again have removed in part ;—that one expresses by a large compass of words,¹ (particularly in connecting sentences and passing from one topic to another,) what in another is usually compressed into a narrower space ; that one abounds in ellipses, another employs them more sparingly ; that one glows with figures and allegories, another is distinguished for plainness and severity of diction ; that one is loose and ambiguous, another definite and precise ; that one is suited to all the purposes of speculation and philosophical inquiry, another either not at all adapted to such subjects, or capable of treating them only by borrowing from a foreign source ; that one is rich and copious, another labours under a poverty of words. Such being the case, who can hope ever to be able to translate from one language into another, so as to fulfil the conditions expressed above, that word shall answer to word, signification to signification.

¹ Vid. Perizonius ad Sanctii Minerva, pp. 434, 486, et passim.

Writers themselves, moreover, differ so much in their diligence, care, rhetorical skill, genius, practice, that while one, in translating, may be easily followed ; in another, there is always something to be added or removed, altered or softened, something which must be understood with limitation, or expressed by a circumlocution ;—that while in interpreting one, you must compel him, as it were, into order ; in the case of another you may point out clearly what he would say. Now when this diversity is added to that which arises out of the very nature and condition of languages, the possibility of a literal translation is still further diminished.

Since then, for the reasons now stated, the thing is impracticable, it only remains for the translator to express the *sense* of his author in such words as he can. This is necessary, sometimes in respect to single words, sometimes in respect to entire sentences and propositions. In the case of single words, of which the very signification cannot be expressed in a translation, without rendering the translation obscure and ambiguous, and incongruous to the language into which the translation is made, the course we pursue is, *to give the notion, which, in this particular place and connexion, may be substituted for the notion of the word employed by the writer himself.* Thus the sense is given in place of the signification.¹ For instance, since *προσέχειν τινί*, *adhibere rem alicui*, (which is the signification,) by no means admits, when *γνώμην* or *νοῦν* is not expressed, of being every where rendered, *to attend to a thing, turn the attention, employ the mind upon it* ; this signification is exchanged for another, such as the *condition* of the passage (the subject and object expressed by the words in that passage) may suggest and allow, and *προσέχειν ταῖς τιμαῖς* is, *to be studious, or ambitious of honours, to be devoted to them, to be delighted and governed by them* ; *προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπό τινος*,² *to assent to, and approve of, what is said by another*, *προσέχειν τῷ Καίσαρι*, *to follow the party of Cæsar* ; and *προσοχὴ νόμων*³ is attributed to one who *endeavours to express* the precepts of wisdom in his conduct. In as many ways, then, and from as many causes and motives as it is possible or usu-

¹ Semler (App. ad Interp. N. T. p. 99.) perceived the difference between the sense and the signification.

² Acts 8: 6, comp. v. 12, where this very *προσέχον τοῖς λαλουμένοις* is exchanged for *πιστεύειν*. Comp. Acts 16: 14.

³ Wisd. 6: 18.

al for the mind to be applied to any thing, in so many ways the notion may be given in a translation or exposition, expressing the cause, manner, or motive, in accordance with which the mind is applied in the present case, by the present individual, to this particular thing. In the case of entire sentences, which cannot be rendered word for word in a translation, our course is, to express *the thing*, which the writer has expressed in his own words, in *such words of another language*, as will present before the mind of readers *the same thing, generally conceived*. Thus again the sense is given instead of the signification. If λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχειν,¹ for instance, cannot be rendered *to present or exhibit the doctrine of salvation*, nor συντρέχειν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσιν,² *to run into the same excess of riot*, the sense and thing may be given in some other words. Thus the former would be, *to shew forth (prae se ferre) the doctrine of salvation*;³ the latter, *to rush forward in the same career, into the same gulf of wickedness*.⁴ The words of the poet,⁵ ἀρχαὶ ἐπληροῦντο,

¹ Phil. 2: 16.

² 1 Pet. 4: 4.

³ That is, so to exhibit it in one's life and conduct, as to convince others of its power and excellence, and lead them to the love of it. See Beza and Erasm. Schmid. a. h. l. Both the genius of the language, and the connexion of the passage, seem to me to admit of this sense; and it is confirmed by the analogy of the Latin, when the phrase *prae se ferre* is sufficiently understood. The other versions, *habere, tenere, tueri, continere, attendere*, (respecting which see Theodoret ad h. l. though he confounds ἐπέχειν τι and ἐπέχειν τινι,) I have no wish to examine separately; but I cannot approve those who endeavour to find here the Greek form of expression τοῦτο ἐπέχει λόγον τινός, *this stands in the place, serves the purpose, of something*; as when the stars are said by night to serve for light, ἐπέχειν λόγον φωτός · a phraseology to which Chrysostom ad h. l. seems to refer, (though I do not sufficiently understand his explanation,) and which Wetstein has illustrated. I cannot approve these, because λόγος ζωῆς in sacred Scripture, undoubtedly always means *the doctrine of salvation*; and, whatever may be said in favour of employing that merely Greek phrase to explain the present passage, it would after all, in my opinion, be a very forced interpretation.

⁴ See L. Bos, in Observat. ad N. T. Wetstein ad h. l. and Alberti ad Hesychium, who defines ἀνάχυσιν, *φουρμόν*. Likewise the definition of ἀνάχυσιν by σύγχυσιν, found in *Catena Oecumenii*, (p. 160. edit. Veron. 1532,) amounts to the same thing. This explains the origin and sense of the Vulgate rendering: *confusionem*, i. e. *colluvium*.

⁵ Eurip. Androm. v. 1100. [1097.]

cannot be rendered, *the magistracies were filled*, but the fact reported, and the sense, are, *the magistrates assembled in crowds, the council was full*. So who would attempt to translate verbally the following passage from Dionysius of Halicarnassus,¹ *ἡ πόλις ἐν καλλίστῃ κεῖται συνόδῳ ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσι*? the sense of which is, 'the city is conveniently situated for a general assembly of the nation.'

If the foregoing remarks are correct, it follows, that the *sense* of a passage differs from the *signification* of the single words; and that the sense is very often expressed in translations in the manner which has just before been described.

The same distinction between the sense and the signification, which it is necessary to observe in translating, should also be kept in view when the object is simply to explain a writer without any design of translating him. No one supposes that an interpreter fully discharges his duty by illustrating single words and phrases; but he is expected to furnish a clear exposition of the matter, the sense, which lies concealed under those words. In order to do this, it is not enough to explain the subject of which a writer has been treating, as for instance, the history, the ceremonies, the philosophical doctrines, and so forth; it *should* be the endeavour of the interpreter to lead his reader to consider words in every possible light, and to teach him to think in different ways; so that, if he is a European, he may compare the style of the people of the East with that of his own, until he can substitute the one for the other, conceive the subject in his own way, and express it in his own words; so that he may compare the ancient with the more recent, and discriminate the difference; so that he may distinguish the poetic diction from that of prose, and substitute the latter for the former; so that he may define with accuracy what does not admit of being pressed too close to the letter of the author, so as to leave nothing which requires further limitation, exception, doubt, or modification; so that he may reduce figures of speech and the language of

¹ Archaeol. lib. 8. p. 484, edit. Sylb. Comp. Xenoph. Hist. Gr. 6. 2. 6, *ἡ νῆσος ἐν καλῷ κεῖται τοῦ βλάπτειν*, is conveniently situated for annoying.

common life to those notions and technical terms which are defined in the schools of philosophy, or generally received in art; so that he may substitute the definition for the thing defined, and the reverse; so that in place of a circumlocution or description he may name the object described with a single word; so that he may compare many languages with each other. A great many other particulars might be mentioned; but in all these the difference of the signification from the sense is obvious, and in proportion as an interpreter is studious of perspicuity, he aims to express the sense, often even by abandoning the significations; since it is not unfrequently the case, that he who retains the latter, is ignorant of the former. Indeed it is a common thing, especially with new beginners, to understand all the significations in a passage, and yet at the same time neither to arrive at the sense of that passage, nor to be able to express it in words. While on the other hand, another of quicker perception, easily seizes the sense of a passage, or rather conjectures it; although if interrogated respecting the precise significations of the words, that is, respecting the reasons why he thinks this to be the sense of the passage, he is unable to give any satisfactory reply.

Having thus, as I imagine, said enough to recal to the recollection of my readers in what cases the sense differs from the signification, and to explain in general the meaning of the proposition, I may now proceed and show still further, in what ways the sense is usually substituted for the signification. In doing this, remarks may be occasionally introduced, respecting the consequent duties imposed both on the translator and on the interpreter of a book; respecting the utility of the rule; and respecting the precautions which are necessary in applying it.

The ways in which it is customary to give the real sense, without strictly adhering to the letter, are exceedingly numerous, nor would any one have the patience to enumerate them all. But whoever will carefully reflect upon the following examples, which have not been taken at random, but expressly selected for the present occasion, will be able, I think, in most instances, to find a rule to which each individual case may be reduced.

In the first place, then, when we cannot express the signification of a word by a single word, whether because it would render the translation obscure or too close to the letter, or because the word occurs but once, or because there is no word in the other

language which exactly corresponds to it,¹ or because it was coined and invented by the writer himself, (of which kind examples abound in Homer, Pindar, Æschylus, and those epigrammatic writers of the Anthology, who are for the most part too sedulous imitators of the tragic and lyric diction,) or because, from being used with reference to some art or science, or by the will of the writer, it receives a broader or more limited signification than in common life; it is necessary that we should either present a notion which may with propriety be substituted for that of the word which the writer employs,² or that we should introduce a circumlocution by means of which the notion of the word which we wish to explain, may be defined, or described, or analyzed into its constituent parts. But who does not see that the sense is here given by the interpreter, instead of the signification?

Let us consider the first case, in which one notion is substituted for another. No one is at a loss for the meaning of *ἀτελεύτητος*; but when the Oedipus of Sophocles³ in his anger calls the inexorable Tiresias *ἀτελεύτητος*, it is indeed plain, so far as the sense is concerned, that he is called *obstinate, unyielding, intractable*;⁴ yet neither of these epithets expresses the very signification of the word. For this denotes *one who knows not how to desist, who never ceases* to resist and oppose, with whom the controversy is continually breaking out afresh when you think it has been finished and settled. Now should one express this meaning of the word by the words *obstinate, unyielding, intractable*, would he not substitute for one notion, that is, for the signification of the word, another and a similar one? But should he adhere to the etymology, and say with Abresch (ad Hesychium) *one who knows not how to desist, finire nescius*, would it not, in this case, be necessary to proceed still further and define the exact meaning from the context? since there are many ways in which one may be said *not to know how to desist*. Hence it will conduce both to brevity, and to perspicuity, to express the sense by substituting one notion for another. Such

¹ Such is *ἐντίμεια*, vid. ad Longin. de Sublim. 30. 1. Also *ἀνθάδεια*, Fischeri index Theophrast. in h. v.

² See page 64 above.

³ Oed. Tyr. v. 344. p. 166. ed. Steph.

⁴ Such nearly are the epithets given in the scholia, *δυσάξιλος, δυσπαράξιλος, ἀμείλιχος*.

instances are, when ἀπλότης¹ is rendered *ingenuous liberality*, or καταναρχῶν,² to be *severe towards others, troublesome to them*.

Interpretations of this sort, where one notion is substituted for another, are of the most frequent occurrence; especially in works aiming to explain the Hebrew writers, and poets of the higher class. Numerous examples will every where present themselves to any one who turns over ever so hastily the glossaries and scholia. To this class belong many explanations of the books of the Old and New Testament in the works of Chrysostom,³ of Theodoret, and of Theophylact. To this class

¹ 2 Cor. 8: 2. 9: 11. On the first passage one Codex has the gloss χρηστότης, and Chrysostom and Theodoret exchange for these, φιλοτιμία, προθύμους παρέχειν, δαψίλεια, ἐλεημοσύνη.

² 2 Cor. 11: 8. Cf. Hesychius in κατενάρχησα.

³ For the sake of those who cannot examine the works of this writer themselves, I have placed here a few examples. The following are selected from the Homilies on the first Epistle to the Corinthians :

I. 19, ἀπώλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν — ἔδειξεν οὖσαν ἀνόητον.

VII. 34, μεμερίσται ἡ γ. κ. ἡ παρθ. — διεστήχασαι.

IX. 17, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι — κηρῦξαι ἐπειτατόμην.

" 26, οὐκ ἀδύλως — : — οὐκ εἰκῇ καὶ μάτην, πρὸς σκοπὸν βλέπων.

X. 13, ἀνθρώπινος πειρασμός — μικρὸς, βραχὺς, σίμμετρος.

" 16, κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος — μετοχή i. e. *fruition*, evidently as in the Vulg. vers. *participatio*. The mind of Chrysostom and of the Vulgate translation has been rightly apprehended by the authors of the Libb. Symbol. p. 600, ed. Rechenb.

The examples which follow are taken from the Homilies on the second Epistle to the Corinthians.

I. 9, ἀπόκριμα — ψῆφος, κρίσις, προσδοκία.

V. 13, ἐξέστημεν — μέγα τι φθεγγόμεθα.

σωφρονοῦμεν — μετρίον τι καὶ ταπεινὸν λαλοῦμεν.

" 14, συνέχει — οὐκ ἀφήσιν ῥαθυμῆσαι, ἡσυχάζειν, ἵπνωσαι.

VI. 14, ἐτεροζυγεῖν — ἑαυτὸν ἐκκλίνειν.

IX. 8, εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγθόν, ἵνα καὶ ἑτέροις παρέχητε.

X. 1, ταπεινός — εὐκαταφρόνητος.

θαρσύνω εἰς ὑμᾶς — φνσῶμαι, κομπάζω, κατεξανίσταμαι ὑμῶν.

XI. 7, ἑμὲ ταπεινῶν — ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ διαγαγῶν.

" 28, ἡ ἐπισύστασις μου — αἱ πολιορκίαι τῶν δῆμων, αἱ ταραχαὶ, οἱ θόρυβοι.

XIII. 4, ζησόμεθα — σοιζόμεθα.

" 9, δυνατοί — ἐνάρετοι, δοκιμοί.

For the sake of those who are conversant with the Greek, I add,

belong the multitude of various readings, which have sprung from marginal glossaries, and ought to be expunged from the list of various readings. To the same class belong innumerable words in the Greek versions of the Old Testament; for whoever has simply looked into the *indices* of Tromm, or the *lexica* annexed to these indices, and the *Hexapla* of Montfaucon, even though he may not have examined the versions themselves, could not fail to perceive that where one Greek word stands for so many Hebrew words, it does not express the signification, but in almost every case the sense.

If we would express this substitution of one notion for another, which is of so common occurrence, by a single word, and refer the thing to its appropriate class, we might, with the rhetoricians, call it *metonymy* and *synecdoche*; or borrowing a word from the philosophers we might term it the *adjunct* or *connotate*. For the interpreter expresses what is antecedent to, or consequent upon, the thing which the writer names, or what is done by it, or what is in any way connected with it, whether in nature, or in the thought. He, therefore, who knows what a metonymy is, upon what foundation it rests, of how many classes it consists, will be able without difficulty to form a judgment respecting interpretations of this sort. He who recollects that adjunct and connotate notions are derived from the connexion of things, will not be surprised to learn that in the thousand modes of this connexion, a thousand ways may be found of substituting one notion for another; that different nations and languages may have in view different connexions; that one connexion may be more clear and evident than another; that the most practised thinker will possess the readiest faculty for discovering the connexion; that he who is the most habituated to closeness of thinking, will possess the greatest tact for investigating those notions which are most nearly allied; nor finally, will it surprise him, that there should be such a vast diversity of interpreters and of interpretations.

The more foundation there is for the above remarks, (and

that many of the interpretations to be met with in the ancient glossaries relating to the books of the N. T. are taken from the Homilies of Chrysostom; and that the explanations of words in the O. T. are likewise often drawn from the commentaries of Theodoret. Besides, not a few seem to have been introduced into the glossaries from the epistles of Isidorus Pelusiotes.

they are confirmed by the experience of all who engage in the business of interpretation,) the more surprising it is, that there should be any disposed to bring against this mode of interpretation the charge of looseness and negligence; taxing it with too great a departure from the letter, and with inventing significations at random which are no significations at all. What then? Is that interpreter to be accused of looseness, who, first of all, explains, either by the etymology or by the *usus loquendi*, what lies in the words themselves, that is, shows the exact signification, and then, if there remain notwithstanding some degree of obscurity about it, places that signification in some other point of view, examines into the connexion (relation) of that notion with other notions, treats metonymy as metonymy, until he finds a way of exchanging the notion for another agreeable to the context? Take for instance the word which I have just before mentioned, *καταπραΐν*,—would he be a more sound and careful interpreter, who with very minute attention to the etymology, should say that it means, either, *to render torpid*, deafen with entreaty,—or *to grow torpid*, to become fatigued and remit one's efforts,—or *to be torpid*, without feeling, severe, unmerciful,—I say would he be a more careful expounder than one, who, having gone through with all this, should say that after all nothing else can be elicited and understood from the word than simply *to be troublesome to others*, or severe in exacting one's due? especially as the writer expresses himself thus in another place.¹ Pray what will be wanting either to truth or perspicuity, if the sense be thus given in lieu of the signification? It is vain, therefore, to admonish one, and charge him with not giving the significations, if he say, *πνευματικοί* sometimes means *the more advanced, more perfect Christians*, those who are *truly changed for the better*,² while *σαρκοί* denotes *the weak, unenlightened, less established*,³ and *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα*, *scanty knowledge*, such as belongs to men destitute of divine teaching and left wholly to themselves.⁴ Who ever pretended that these are the exact significations in the proper and strict meaning? No, the sense of these words is thus expressed in another language, by a legitimate substitution of one notion for another, agreeably to the context. It amounts to the same thing, to take an example, whether you say, *εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου*, or *εἶναι*

¹ 2 Cor. 11: 13, 16.² Gal. 6: 1.³ 1 Cor. 3: 1.⁴ Matth. 16: 17.

ἐκ τῆς γῆς, or εἶναι ἐκ τῶν κάτω, for we find these expressions used promiscuously by the sacred writers.¹ Hence too the phrases εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and ἐκ τῶν ἄνω, express the same thing, for these also are promiscuously used.² Now as the former must be rendered *worldly*, and *earthly*, and *inferior*, so the latter must be rendered *divine*, *celestial*, *superior*.³ These then are the generic significations; they express the class. But is it sufficient to know this? Certainly not. Unless you proceed still further to investigate the species, this generic notion will not answer your purpose in the least. Now the term *earthly* may mean vile, or imperfect, or ignorant, or vicious, or perishable. In as many ways, then, as the notion of the word *worldly* or *earthly* may be varied (limited), in so many ways it is plain that the notion of the word *divine* or *celestial* may be varied. Therefore *celestial* means either pre-eminent, or perfect, or intelligent, or faultless, or imperishable. Should one say that John, ἐκ τῆς γῆς ὄντα, when compared with Christ, is *inferior*, *of less worth*,⁴ he would not, it is true, translate word for word; but would he not give the true sense, the adjunct notion of the

¹ John 8: 23.² John 3: 31.

³ This mode of rendering, which expresses such phrases by an adjective, is required, first, by the custom of speaking partly Hebrew and partly Greek. For οἱ ὄντες ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας means *those who are devoted to the truth*, i. e. *who understand and love the truth*, John 18: 37; the same phrase 1 John 3: 19, signifies *to be upright, sincere*; οἱ ὄντες ἐξ ἐριθείας, *given to contention*, i. e. *contentious, uncompliant*, Rom. 2: 8; ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, *prone to wickedness, wicked*, 1 John 3: 12. So Gal. 3: 7, οἱ ἐκ πίστεως i. e. οἱ πιστεύοντες, and v. 10, οἱ ἐξ ἔργων, i. e. ἐργαζόμενοι, *who are devoted to the faith, or to the observance of the Mosaic law*; Acts 5: 38, ἡ βουλὴ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων οὕσα, *a merely human contrivance*. Secondly, the sacred writers themselves interchange this phraseology with adjectives; as James 3: 15, τὸ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενον is opposed to τῇ ἐπιγῆῳ. Hence τὸ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενον means *celestial, divine*. In the same manner 2 Cor. 5: 1; 2, τὸ οἰκητήριον ἐκ Θεοῦ and ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, is opposed to τῇ ἐπιγῆῳ, (it means therefore *celestial, divine*, i. e. *immortal*), and is conjoined with αἰώνιος, ἀχειροποίητος. All these forms of speaking, then, are to be treated as adjectives, except in those cases where the history or fact in question shows that they must be taken according to the letter; as when it is said of man with reference to his creation, εἶναι ἐκ τῆς γῆς, or of the advent of Christ upon earth, εἶναι or ἐληλυθέναι ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

⁴ John 3: 31.

word *earthly*?¹ Would he on this account be any more loose than one who translates, *John is of the earth*? Can he be said to invent a meaning, while the other by adhering strictly to the letter expresses the true sense? Suppose one should carry this rule through, and taking another passage,² render the sentence *ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστὶ*, *lust is vicious, wicked*; there might be some who would choose the sentiment were expressed with more care, but why and on what grounds, it is for themselves to consider. So also, who can deny with a shadow of truth, that *ὁ ὢν ἐκ Θεοῦ*³ means *one who is acquainted with religion, imbued with the knowledge of God and of divine things, θεοδιδάκτος*, hence, a true Christian, and particularly all true teacher? or, who can with propriety doubt that *χοϊκός* means *mortal*, and *οὐράνιος*, *immortal*?⁴ If then, in the first place, it is contrary to the grammatical laws which prevail in other languages, to render such phrases word for word; if again it is not sufficient to express the generic notion, as *divine, celestial*, but it is necessary for the sake of perspicuity to investigate the species subordinate to the genus, to find, that is, how far, in what respect, a thing is said to be *divine, celestial*; and, what is of chief importance, if various examples of all these phrases occur, making it apparent, that they are not every where used in the same way; will it not be allowable, in any passage, to name the species instead of the genus, or to deduce the species from the genus, that is, to give the sense in place of the signification? I might argue in the same manner respecting the words *πνευματικός* and *σαρκικός*; but for the sake of my readers I must forbear. I add only, that it is by this substitution of one notion for another, of which I have been speaking, we arrive at those notions in systematic divinity, which are called dogmatic and proper; when out of the various modes of describing a thing, that one is selected or inductively ascertained,

¹ For the writer himself, John 3: 31, would be understood to include in the words *ὁ ἄνωθεν* or *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος* the meaning *most exalted*, *τὸν ὄντα ἐπάνω πάντων*, as the adjunct notion to these words.

² 1 John 2: 16.

³ 1 John 4: 6, comp. 3 John 11.

⁴ 1 Cor. 15: 47 sq. But in the same manner as *ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς* *ἐστὶ χοϊκός* signifies in this place, *man formed of the earth is mortal*; so John 3: 31, *ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς* signifies, *man born upon this earth is mean and insignificant*.

which properly expresses the thing; when, for instance, from the words ἀνακρίνωσις, καινή πίστις, ἐπιστροφή, ἀναγέννησις, the conclusion is drawn that we must understand either the forsaking of the religion which one has hitherto followed, for Christianity, or the forsaking the love and practice of sin for the disposition and life required by the doctrine of Christ. It is not a distinctly defined, dogmatic notion, that our bodies will hereafter be *celestial*; but that they will *endure forever* is evidently a notion of this kind.

The case sometimes occurs, that this rule of substituting one notion for another, from being wrongly understood, is abused. There are not wanting those who take it for granted, that every word which they find inserted in the glossaries, lexicons, versions, or commentaries, in place of the word employed by the writer, for the purpose of explaining it, expresses the signification of that word. They therefore seize upon this supposed signification, and apply it to another case, as if the *usus loquendi* were now clearly ascertained, whether it be allowed by the context or not, whether the connexion of notions be the same or different. I will illustrate this error by certain examples, not because I take any pleasure in exposing the mistakes of others, but because I have observed that this error is of no unfrequent occurrence, and it has therefore seemed to me proper to caution the student to be on his guard. I once saw a case in which Ovid's description of the river Peneus, which flows through the valley of Tempe in Thessaly:

Peneus — sonitu plus quam vicina fatigat,¹

was interpreted in the following manner: "The river Peneus, by the rush of its waters, *excites* (that is, attracts) the attention, not only of the neighbourhood, but even of remote regions." At first, I was at a loss to imagine what it was that led the author to suppose the verb *fatigat* was to be taken in this particular sense; but after some inquiry I understood the reason to be this, that in a certain passage of Virgil,² where one is said *socios fatigare*, the verb *fatigare* bears the meaning *to excite*. Hence it seemed that the same signification might be attributed to the same word in the passage from Ovid. But what confounding of notions and things is this! In Virgil a person is said *fatigare*

¹ Metamorph. I. 573.

² Æneid. IV. 572.

socios, who urges them on with exhortations and encouragements, or if you please to express the sense with another word, who excites, instigates his companions. Now will you seize upon this case, and, because *fatigare* admits of being so explained in this passage, say that *fatigare* may every where mean *to excite*, and be used for every species and mode of exciting? and interpret the sentence *fluvium strepitu aures fatigantem*, a river which excites, attracts the attention, by its noise? The truth is, a river *sonitu fatigans* means simply one which, by its incessant din, at last fatigues the ear, and *vicina fatigans*, one whose noise is heard by the neighbourhood without end, even to satiety and weariness. There is here, then, not the least resemblance with the passage of Virgil; unless we may take the sense of the word *fatigare*, which in this particular connexion, as found in Virgil, is expressed by a legitimate substitution of one notion for another, to stand for the signification of the word, or for the notion associated with the word by the *usus loquendi*.—I have marked another example. Some one had read in John,¹ ἔχειν τὸν πατέρα, ἔχειν τὸν υἱόν, and had heard that it was to be explained, *to acknowledge the Father*, etc. Assisted by this remark, he imagined he had found a way of explaining that difficult passage,² where women are commanded ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς, and proceeded, without hesitation, to expound it as follows: *They ought to acknowledge the authority in their head*, i. e. in the person of the husband, or the authority of the husband. It is hardly to our purpose to refute this; I will however say, in reply, that the interpretation arose from confounding the signification of the words with the sense of a passage. The sense, it is true, of the phrase ἔχειν Θεόν, may be thus expressed, *to acknowledge God*, although this explanation falls short of expressing the whole meaning of the words; because, in the first place, it is plain from the opposite, ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν Θεόν, that he is said ἔχειν τὸν Θεόν, who adheres to the doctrine which he has received; and again, in this epistle, ἔχειν Θεόν and κοινωνίαν ἔχειν μετὰ Θεοῦ, and εἶναι ἐν Θεῷ, are interchanged for each other, and denote the whole of that intimate relation between God and man which is produced by religion, and of which the acknowledgment of God is but a part. The sense, then, may be expressed as above; but it does not follow that this is a signification of the verb ἔχειν, which you are at liberty to transfer to whatever passage you please. But as the error is manifest

¹ 1 John 2: 23. 5: 12.² 1 Cor. 11: 10.

in these examples, so I fear it may be the case, that not a few significations, taken in a similar manner from the Alexandrine version of the Hebrew text, where, as usual, the sense is loosely expressed, have been attached to Hebrew words, which cannot be given to these words under the name and in the place of a signification. Then again significations have been obtruded upon certain Greek words of that version, which were designed to express the general sense of a passage, and not the significations of single words, as if the translation had been word for word, and from thence transferred into the books of the New Testament; a case which, I fear, but too often occurs in the *Exercitationes Sacrae* of Heinsius.

I have said enough respecting that method of giving the sense in place of the signification of single words, which consists in substituting one notion for another. The other method, as was stated above, is to give a circumlocution of every word, the notion of which cannot be expressed by another single word, so as to exhaust the whole sense. Now if every writer had himself defined the words of this sort, as Andocides¹ does *ἐπιτιμία* in the Attic law, and Cicero² *mores*, in the works of the academicians and peripatetics; or if words of this class were all technical terms of the arts and sciences; this part of interpretation would be comparatively easy. But when words also of common life receive, by the will of the writer, in only a single place, a force and signification increased by various accessory notions, which are not constantly associated with them either by the *usus loquendi*, or in other cases; or when in certain passages certain words have a broader signification than belongs to them in their ordinary use, and there is, therefore, a call upon the discrimination and diligence of the interpreter, to define their meaning, from the opposites, from the object of the discourse, from the entire context, from history; the thing is attended with a great deal more difficulty. Nor ought we to be surprised, if, in fixing upon the meaning of such words, men should be found to adopt very different opinions. We have a remarkable case of this kind in Matt. 5: 17, where *πληρῶσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας* is commonly rendered, either, *to conform one's life and conduct to the precepts given by Moses and the prophets*; or, *to teach the doctrine of Moses and the prophets*; or, *to do, to speak, to advance the things which were predicted by those ancient writers*. But no one of these interpretations, taken alone, expresses the entire sense.

¹ Orat. de Mysteriis, p. 36 ed. Reisk.

² Quæst. Acad. I. 5.

For although the words *καταλῦσαι* and *πληρῶσαι* are shortly after exchanged for *λῦσαι* and *ποιῆσαι*, and so exchanged, that on account of this *ποιῆσαι* (v. 19) nothing else can be understood than to obey or not to obey the prescriptions of the law, and therefore the same meaning must be attached to *καταλῦσαι* and *πληρῶσαι*; yet with this signification another is associated, viz. *truly and exactly to teach the doctrines* of the law, that others may not be led into error, either of opinion or practice.¹ This signification is necessarily associated with the former. For, in the first place, Christ expressly adds *διδάσκειν* (v. 19), and thus enlarges the compass of the word, and shows in what sense he would be understood, what accessory notion he means to have implied. But we are bound to hear this interpreter of his own words. In the second place, he is disputing with Jewish teachers, who not only violated the divine law in their practice, but perverted it by their false interpretations. In the third place, let us ask what is his object in the whole of this passage, where he demonstrates at length that he fulfils, *πληρῶσαι*, the ancient doctrine? He exhibits himself as a teacher, places his own discipline in opposition to that of the Jewish schools, and teaches with accuracy and truth the doctrines of religion. As then the accessory meaning to which I have just adverted is expressly joined to the verbs *λῦσαι* and *ποιῆσαι*; the same must be understood as being joined to the verbs *καταλῦσαι* and *πληρῶσαι*, which are interchanged with the former; not that this conjoint signification is constant, but because a second signification is, in this particular passage, added to the first, so that both should be understood at one and the same time.² So when Christ de-

¹ Chrysostom, in his Homily on this place, after having enumerated various opinions concerning the word *πληρῶσαι*, finally prefers that, which we are now exhibiting. He says then among other things: *Ὁ Χριστὸς διορθοῖ τὸν νόμον. Τρανότερον μέλλει λέγειν. Τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λεγόμενα οὐκ ἦν ἀναίρεσις τῶν προτέρων* (i. e. of the law and the prophets) *ἀλλ' ἐπίτασις* (he urges more diligently, inculcates more severely) *καὶ πληρώσις. Ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπιτείνει τὴν ἀρετὴν. Οὐκ ἐναντιοῦται, ἀλλὰ συγκροτεῖ αὐτά. Ὁ νόμος ἔχει πλείονα ἀσφάλειαν.* Thus broad is the meaning of the verb *πληρῶσαι* in this place, in the opinion of Chrysostom; for he supposes that all this is comprehended in that single word.

² That when a doctrine is said *πληροῦσθαι*, there is contained in the word *πληροῦν* the notion of living and acting up to the requisitions of the doctrine in question, is evident from the examples, Rom.

clares, first, that it is his design *πληρῶσαι*; secondly, that it is not his design *καταλῦσαι*; thirdly, that he only deserves to be approved, who both *lives* as the law requires, and *teaches* it with truth and exactness; it follows, that Christ *πληρῶν τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας*, means, he lives conformably to the law, and teaches it correctly to others. The general scope of the argument is this: Christ neither is, nor wishes to be considered, a teacher of the same character with the Jewish teachers. They perverted the doctrines of revelation, both by their teaching and by their life, which is the sense of *καταλῦσαι*. It is, therefore, the design of Christ to establish those doctrines, both by his teaching and by his life, which is the sense of *πληρῶσαι*. But if the interpreter who retains only one notion of the verb, and admits in *πληρῶσαι* no other sense than that of a life agreeable to the law, does not exhaust the entire meaning of the passage; so also, for the same reason, he is in an error, who finds in this verb no other meaning than that of correctly teaching. As to the opinion which some have entertained, that *πληρῶσαι* has respect to the fulfilment of prophecies, it is not so true, that this sense belongs to the word in this particular passage of Matthew, as that it usually may belong to it, and from this circumstance, is said to belong to it in other places. But let it be there. I do not object. Yet if any one maintains that this is the only thing referred to, it does not meet the case; for the object here is simply to declare in what light Christ will be regarded as a teacher of religion, the question not relating to his whole work as a matter of prophecy. But let us apply these remarks, which have been so often repeated, to our present object. If, then, *πληρῶσαι* is, to establish, to confirm by one's teaching and life; it is very evident that this interpretation does not depend on the common signification of the word; but that the compass of the signification, which this place demands, must be ascertained by going through the parts, and the notion of the verb collected from the *usus loquendi*, from the opposites, from the object of the discourse, from what the writer himself has added and designed to have united with these words, from history; for each of these particulars contributes something to the full and com-

13: 8. Gal. 6: 2. That it also contains the sense of correctly teaching, appears from the use of the verb *קמץ*. Comp. Buxtorf. Lex. Talmud. p. 451. Vitringæ Observ. Sac. Tom. I. p. 207. Schoettgen. Hor. Hebr. et Talm. Tom. I. p. 27.

plete notion of these words, in this place. But a notion, consisting of so many parts, could with difficulty be expressed by any single word of another language, which should comprise the whole. For although λῦσαι might be not badly translated to *pervert*, and πληρῶσαι to *establish*, yet the question returns, what is it to pervert or establish a doctrine, (for this may be done in various ways,) and the meaning must be more fully explained, so that readers may understand that what the writer had chiefly in view was this: *The doctrine is misrepresented by false interpretations, and the life of the teacher does not correspond to its requisitions.* Thus the interpretation is reduced to a circumlocution, and wherever this is employed, the sense is given in place of the signification. The student of sacred literature, then, should often turn his attention to this rule when he meets with such words as possess among the Hebrews a manifold signification, as ἀσθένεια, σάρξ, πνεῦμα, and such, in which several significations are sometimes compacted together, as it were, in the same place, so that it becomes in a manner necessary for the interpreter to define one word of this class by two in another language. Thus it is scarcely possible, in every case, to explain without a circumlocution the phrase βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, because all the parts of this word, viz. *the church of Christ, the blessings belonging peculiarly to this church both on earth and in a future world, then God as the author of all these, or, the agency of God in planning, decreeing and executing the whole economy,*—all these are sometimes to be understood as embraced and comprehended together.

Here I may be allowed to express my views respecting the duty of one who translates books into another language, in regard to passages of this sort. So far as it regards the first class, then, where one notion is substituted for another, I might say in general, that it should be the endeavour of the translator to have the notion of the word, which is substituted for another, come as near as possible to the notion of the word for which it is substituted; upon an attention to which, indeed, the highest merit of translations usually depends. But it rarely suffices to give general rules; and who does not see that this must be done, of his own accord? I will endeavour to descend to particulars. A translator, then, should place a figure, wherever the writer employs a figure for the sake of ornament or variety;¹ a signifi-

¹ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἡ θύρα, as the Greeks express it, Lycurg. in Leocr. 10. ἀν-

cant word where the writer himself has placed such a word ;¹ he should avoid figures where the writer himself expresses himself in plain language ; he should not employ technical words of the arts and sciences, like the word *perfection*, instead of the words of common life, like the word *probity*, which the writer has employed ; as when the sacred writers say of a man that he is *τέλειος* ; he should not use a generic term, where the writer has employed a specific one ;² nor the antecedent in place of the consequent.³ As it respects expressions which depend solely

γαῖαν Plutarch. Pelop. c. 19, cannot be translated *humid disposition* ; it should be rendered, therefore, by a change of metaphor, *pliant, flexible, one which may be trained*. *Ἐτεροζυγῆν*, to incline, preponderate to the other side, 2 Cor. 6: 14. Comp. the passage from Photius in Wetstein and in Catena Occumenii, p. 533. *Ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον*, Is. 54: 1. Gal. 4: 27, *rumpe vocem* ; comp. Intt. ad Virg. *Æn.* II. 129. *Ὁσμὴ θανάτου* and *ζωῆς*, a deadly and a salubrious odour, or, an object which destroys and refreshes by its odour, 2 Cor. 2: 15. Comp. Buxtorf. Lex. Rab. Talm. p. 1493. Schoetgen. Hor. Hebr. et Talm. Tom. I. p. 683. Schulz, in edit. Epp. ad Corinth. ad h. l. But what is added for the sake of explaining, *εἰς θάνατον, εἰς ζωὴν*, should be rendered *noxious, useful*, or, *rendering miserable, or happy*. For these are added, not to embellish, but to explain that the preaching of the apostles is here said to be a fragrant object, which refreshes, in so far as it is useful, renders the man who receives it happy ; and that it is compared to deadly odours, in so far as it tends to the injury of such as reject it when offered to them. But by confining this rule to figures which are employed for the sake of embellishment and variety, I mean to have it understood, that in respect to other figures, which enter into the language of ordinary life, it is left free to the translator to use proper words in their place ; a case which occurs in the instance of many words, expressing a notion peculiar to religion or to some science, as *ἀγαγενῆσθαι, ἐπιστρέφεισθαι*, and in the schools of the Academy *κατάληψις*, to which a like figure in other languages might hardly correspond.

¹ I mean what the Greek rhetoricians call *σημαντικόν*, i. e. very emphatic, significant. Such a case occurs in Paul's epistle to the Philippians, c. 3: 2, *βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν*, *beware of that mutilation of doctrine, which those defenders of Judaism support* ; and *πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, Gal. 4: 9, of the ritual laws of the Jews, as very insignificant elements.

² He should not render *ἔργον καλόν* a good action, *recte factum*, but a kindness, *beneficium*, John 10: 33. Matt. 26: 10. 2 Cor. 9: 8. The same use is frequently made of *קָרָן* and *רַך*.

³ *Ἀγχιος ἀνήρ*, in Sophocles, Oed. Tyr. v. 344, should not be

upon an excited state of mind, as reproaches,¹ complaints,² lamentations, indignation,³ so also proverbs, and forms of speaking similar to proverbs,⁴ he should carefully compare them with the language of common life, and express in the translation what the men of our own country and age say under similar circumstances, so as neither to give the sense in a vague and general manner, nor to produce a translation too close to the letter. And in all cases he should estimate the import and force of substantives (subjects) from the nature and import of adjectives and verbs (predicates), the observance of which will serve as a very sure rule in substituting one notion for another, and an ever present remedy against error and negligence. But what I have now said may suffice; he who would enter more fully and accurately into the laws of translation, must first examine into the principles of these laws. These principles are to be found in the design, which is to give a close version and not a loose para-

rendered *severe, inexorable, but cruel, immitis*. In Rom. 8: 27, and 1 Cor. 2: 10, *ἐρευνᾶν τὰ πάντα*, should not be expressed *to know*, but *to penetrate* (with the understanding) *all things*. These expressions I know are similar; but the translator of a book should be urged to use the greatest possible care.

¹ Concerning the word *ῥακά*, Matt. 5: 22, Chrysostom (p. 199, ed. Frankf.) writes: οὐ μεγάλης ἐστὶν ὕβρεως ῥῆμα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καταφρονήσεως καὶ ὀλιγορίας. So far well; but that which follows is much better, where he compares the thing with a fact in common life: καθάπερ ἡμεῖς ἢ οἰκίταις ἢ τισι τῶν καταδεστέρων ἐπιτίττοντες λέγομεν· ἄπελθε σύ· εἰπέ τῷ θεῷ σύ· οὕτω καὶ οἱ τῇ Σύρων περημένοι γλώττῃ ῥακά λέγουσιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ Σὺ τοῦτο τιθένης. From this both the rendering and the sense may be much more correctly ascertained than by following out the etymology. I would not make Chrysostom and the use of the Greek language in common life a rule of interpretation; I am aware that this *ῥακά* must be explained from the Hebrew language; but I am showing what it is to illustrate such words by comparisons drawn from common life, and by referring to the manners and words of another race.

² Ἡ ψυχὴ περίλυπός ἐστι ἕως θανάτου.

³ Ps. 69: 10 in the translation of Luther is well rendered; but the same words repeated in John 2: 17, are badly rendered. In the former case he consulted common life, in the latter confined himself to the letter.

⁴ 2 Cor. 10: 12, *ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτῷ μετρεῖν, to measure one's self by one's self; συγκρίνειν ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτῷ, to estimate one's self by one's self*. 1b. 6: 7, *ἔχειν ὅπλα δεξιὰ καὶ ἀριστερά, to be armed on either hand*.

phrase ; in the duty of translating with fidelity ; in the importance of so proceeding that the reader may have it in his power, and may be led, to form a just and accurate conception of the thing ; in the necessity of exhibiting, at the same time, the external beauties of diction found in the original ; in the aim to employ another language so that it may seem as if the writer himself must express himself just as we translate, and use this proverb, this exclamation, this formula, were he to write in our language.

As to the latter class, which consists of those words which are to be expressed by a circumlocution, there is one rule which, in my opinion, a translator ought carefully to observe, viz. to imitate the writer himself in selecting a word which, though it may not exhaust, is at least adequate to express, that notion composed of several parts, such for instance as those which have already been mentioned, *λύσαι, to pervert, πληρώσαι, to establish*. But he should remind the reader of the increased compass which, in this place, is to be given to the signification of the word : thus he will neither be censured, because he has not exhausted the whole meaning, (for the writer himself has failed to do this,) nor be liable to the charge of obtruding his own sentiment and mode of explanation upon the writer's language.

I have thus spoken on that part of the subject which relates to giving the sense instead of the signification, in explaining or translating single words. We are now to consider entire sentences and propositions, which, where they do not admit of being translated word for word without obscuring rather than throwing light upon the meaning, are so treated that the sense may be substituted for the significations. In what way this is to be understood, I have already explained. Sometimes, then, where the writer has given a sign or symbol of some truth, the interpreter presents the truth itself indicated by that sign : as when interpreters show that the phrase, ' God descending from heaven,' means God executing some glorious work, or acting in general, knowing, propitious or not propitious ;¹ or when they show

¹ Homer said that God *ἄντιχ' θυσίων*, comes to attend sacrifices, (Il. 67.) Hence Rhea in Apollon. Rhod. l. 1141, in *ἀνταῖη δαίμων*, a goddess that attends sacrifices, or *ἐνλιπένετος*, as the scholiasts explain it. So in the hymns of Orpheus, (10, 21,) God is said *βαίνειν ἐπὶ λουβαῖς*. In all these cases the proper will of the deity is to be understood.

that Christ, sitting at the right hand of God, is Christ reigning with God ;¹ or when they remind us that in the oriental writers, the obscuring of the sun, the darkening of the moon, the trembling of the stars, is the symbol of disastrous times ; and thus, whenever it is said that these natural events are about to take place, the only thing to be understood is, that there are to be disastrous times, in which nature, as it were, will seem threatened with destruction. Here belong all the passages in which God is described as appearing visibly in the character of the future judge, with forms taken from the customs of men, that is, so far as the sense is concerned, ἀποδώσων ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ, as it is expressed Matt. 16: 27.

In explaining these passages, there is no one but sees that the sense must be pointed out ; it is not so easy, however, to understand how it is best to proceed in translating. For in the first place, where it is evident from the enumerating of many signs, that a description is intended picturing forth the thing to the life,² every thing must be closely rendered ; for the interpreter who should here attempt to abridge, or to express the sense in a summary way, would mangle the diction of the writer ; because it is not the writer's intention to present a concise statement to the mind, but to exhibit a picture before the eye. Again, in respect to particular forms of speaking, if a translation by preserving them leads to no error, but any one who reads the translation perceives that these words are to be understood differently from what they are read, (i. e. not to the letter,) as, for instance, when God is spoken of as a man, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς ; there is no reason why they should be changed into a paraphrase or explanation. For who would mistake or hesitate

¹ Him whom David (Ps. 110: 1) describes *sitting upon the right hand of God* until he triumphs over all his enemies, Paul (1 Cor. 15: 25) describes as *reigning* until he triumphs over all his enemies. Therefore to sit upon one's right hand, is to reign with him. The angels, as it is asserted in Heb. 1: 13, 14, are nowhere said to sit on the right hand of God ; but they are every where called ministers, i. e. we nowhere read that the government is committed to them ; comp. Heb. 2: 5, 10: 12. The Jewish priests perform their daily repeated sacrifices *standing*, after the manner of servants, עֲמִידִים לְפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ ; כַּדֹּרִים ; Christ, having finished his sacrifice, is no longer a minister, but sits at the right hand of God, i. e. reigns. This is correctly explained by Vitringa, Obs. Sacr. lib. 2. c. 7.

² As Matt. 24: 29, 30, 31. Joel 3: 1. Daniel 7: 9. — Φαντασία ἐναργής. Εἰδωλοποιία. Long. de Subl. c. 15.

about the meaning, if he should read that men thrown into affliction approach as suppliants to the throne of God? But if the translation, in so far as it is translation—that is, in so far as it is a book written for instance in the English language, and read by the unlearned, who do not understand the language from which it is translated, or if they understand it generally, are unable to interpret a book written in it, from being unacquainted with the necessary rules and helps,—if the translation, viewed in this light, either leads necessarily to error, because it renders word for word, or conveys a contrary sentiment, or none at all: I see not, why we should hesitate to express the sense of the proposition in place of the signification of the words, especially, if an argument is pursued, which does not depend upon the words, but upon the sense, and which no one could comprehend, but by leaving the words out of view and considering the sense of the proposition. Such, as it appears to me, are the phrases, *to intercede for men*,¹ and *to sit on the right hand of the king*,² which for these reasons were so expressed, as it seemed to me they ought to be expressed, in a German version of the epistle to the Hebrews, published some years since at Leipsic. Such are, *Christ became poor, that men might be rich*,³ and, *the*

¹ Heb. 7: 25. How can intercession in the proper sense, that is, prayer for favour or pardon to be bestowed on another, have place between God and his Son? But comp. what I have said in the tract *de utilitate notionum universarum in Theologia*, Dissertationes vol. 1. p. 239, particularly p. 298.

² Heb. 1: 13. The phrase interpreted with reference to our own manners, would be, *to occupy a superior place*; with reference to those of the East, *to be one of the princes of the realm*. Is either true of Christ, sitting at the right hand of the Father? Can it then be translated word for word?

³ 2 Cor. 8: 9. Christ at no time, neither before he was visibly present on the earth, nor during the time of his life here, was rich, in the common sense of the word, and as they were whom Paul was desirous should contribute of their wealth to the poorer class. It cannot then be simply rendered in this way; but requires the addition, *perfectly blessed*. Christ was poor as we are said to be poor, and as they were, concerning whose relief the apostle is speaking. It ought therefore to be simply rendered in this way. We are not, in the proper sense, made rich by the poverty and humiliation of Christ. It cannot therefore be simply rendered in this way; but with the addition *we are enriched with benefits*.

*heavens must receive,*¹ which last I think without any doubt should be rendered, *must be exalted above all,*² and explained, *must reign with absolute power.*

In other instances, what writers have said concerning the part or species, interpreters have transferred to the whole or to the class, and the reverse. For the sentiment which viewed in the former light is too obscure, or harsh, or to be understood with limitation, if it be viewed in the latter, becomes more clear, more delicate, and accurately expressed. The wish of David that the habitation of his enemies, and so of the Messiah's, might be desolate, was fulfilled, according to the interpretation of Peter,³ upon Judas the betrayer of Christ, and is to be referred to him. But it is apparently to be understood in one way as applied to the enemies of David, (if the passage may be supposed to have had primary reference to them,) and in another as applied to Judas. As applied to the enemies of David it may be understood literally; but not so in reference to Judas; for how does it appear, that the habitation of Judas became deserted and desolate after his death? In truth, it would be necessary to do violence to the passage, and resort to ingenious trifling, to make out that the passage, as referred to him, is to be literally understood.⁴ We must make the trial, therefore, in what way the sense may be given *in universum*. To

¹ Acts 3: 21.

² If all had thought so, and had compared a passage of the Old Testament (Ps. 115: 3), or the words in our Lord's prayer (Matt. 6: 9); if they had there concluded, that the supreme governor of all is to be understood, *בְּלֹא אֱמִירָה וְחֵסֶד*, where God is said to be in heaven; and had not trifled upon the word *δεξιόθαι*; the question surely would never have been proposed, whether Christ took possession of heaven, or heaven of him, nor would it have been thought that the majesty of Christ was diminished by being confined as it were to a place, nor would Beza have composed such a note as he has written. The sense, the sense must be sought for; not the significations of single words. By no means.

³ Acts 1: 20.

⁴ Some who perceived that the passage could not be understood literally, chose to understand the desolate habitation as referring to the vacated office. But they neither perceived how forced this would be, nor considered what would follow. If a vacant house is a vacated office, and it follows, let no man dwell therein, the sense of these words would necessarily be, either, *may he have no successor*, or,

express, then, against one, the wish that his house may become desolate, is to express generally the wish that he may be removed out of the way, destroyed. Imprecations are expressions in which, as we may see in common life, the words themselves are not always regarded, but the evil generally in which it is desired that one may be involved: for the language, in which imprecations are commonly conceived, serves only to evince by its moderation or vehemence, the greater or less degree of passion with which the mind is affected, and the greater or less degree of evil which it is desired should fall upon the offender. Thus, to the imprecation of which I am now speaking, the adjunct is, let him be destroyed, and the desolate habitation is, rhetorically speaking, the image of the destruction; logically speaking, the part or species of the destruction; in the language of common life, the example of the destruction. So if we should say, that the meaning in general contained in these words, as referred to Judas, is, *may he be destroyed*, and avoid pressing too close to the letter, we should express no more than what really happened to Judas, and this sense would agree with the design of Peter's discourse. What Peter wished to show was, if Judas has perished, he must have a successor. But if the passage is taken according to the letter, the conclusion would not follow: 'Because the habitation of Judas is desolate, he must have a successor.' Therefore, according to a common custom, Peter selects from an imprecatory Psalm of some length a single imprecation, not because this is to be specially regarded, above all the rest, but that it may appear, to whom all those imprecations may or ought to be referred. For are we to suppose that Paul in repeating the words of David, Rom. 11: 9, was anxious that those particular forms of expression should be retained and insisted upon? On the contrary, he shows that the imprecatory Psalm in question applies as a whole to the Jews. Is it his design that those figurative words should be interpreted as referring to some particular form of evil, as to poverty or to disease? By no means; but he shows that the general sentiment contained in those imprecations is, *let evil fall upon my enemies*. At the same time, it is obvious that in translating passages of this sort, it is not

may he not recover his office. How incongruous this is to the place, need not be shown.—The passage in the Epistle to the Romans (11: 9) certainly proves, that the language of imprecation must not every where be understood literally.

enough to give the sense in general, but the very words of the writer are to be rendered and expressed as they stand; for otherwise, readers might indeed know what the writer had generally before his mind; but they would be left in ignorance as to the words, the force or elegance of the diction, with which the writer had expressed what was in his thoughts.

I now come to those expressions which are allegorical, or illustrate a fact by a similitude. In the interpretation, then, of allegories and similitudes, we proceed so as to derive from them the general sentiment or proposition, which contains summarily and properly expressed, the truth or fact the writer designed to illustrate. For it is proper, in explaining an allegory, to fix the attention upon that which the writer had particularly in view in composing it. The object of all writers in introducing allegories into discourse, is not so much to direct the minds of their hearers to the similitude, as to the fact illustrated by the similitude, the general sentiment; or, what amounts to the same thing, it is not the signification of the words by themselves considered, but the import and sense of the whole passage, which they wish chiefly to be regarded. Thus, for instance, when Christ was asked why he allowed his disciples to fast but seldom or not at all, he answered, according to his usual custom, by allegories;¹ and employed the three following similitudes,—the guests are not usually sad when the bridegroom is present; a new piece of cloth is not put upon an old garment; new wine is not put into old bottles. To these Luke adds a fourth,²—No man having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new. In these similitudes, because they are similitudes, there must be contained, as I have just said, a general sentiment, which must be understood before the import of Christ's reply can be understood. The sentiment here, as it seems to me, is this, *that in common life it is not usual for men to do what is unsuitable to the time, place, circumstances*, etc. For if a man should begin to be sad at a feast, or should apply a new piece of cloth upon an old garment, would not his conduct be generally deemed unsuitable and absurd? Such things in common life are repugnant to the time, place, and circumstances. So whether one employs all these similitudes or only one of them, the same sentiment may, and indeed ought, always to be understood. When Christ then was asked, why he allowed his disciples to be less strict than others in this respect, he gives the following reason by similitudes: Because it is not usual for any one, in the affairs of common life, to do

¹ Matt. 9: 14—18.

² Luke 5: 39.

readily what is unsuitable and inconsistent, neither should or ought he to do in regard to his disciples, nor compel them to do, what was suitable neither to the time nor to the circumstances: But it had been unsuitable to the time and circumstances, if, while he was yet present with them, as their guide and teacher, he had insisted upon their passing a life of sorrow and mortification, and induced them to multiply to no purpose rites of this sort; especially when he knew, that as soon as he was removed from the earth, these disciples would be subjected to a multitude of evils and those of the heaviest kind. He therefore who knew, that his friends were at some future period to enter upon a life full of calamities, and yet would not allow them, when they might, to live in comparative comfort and enjoyment, but should burthen them with troubles sooner than was necessary, would surely do what was repugnant to the circumstances, to the place and time, to the men, and finally to the love due towards others; or he would do the same thing as if one should put on a sad countenance at a feast, or sew a new piece of cloth upon an old garment, or pour new wine into old bottles; in a word, he would do what was discordant with the feelings, and judgment of men in common life. If it shall appear to any one that this method of explaining a similitude does not exhaust the whole meaning, because so many words must be neglected, in reducing them all to a single sentiment, let him follow the method of the ancient, and of not a few modern, commentators; let him examine all the parts of this similitude to the minutest particular, and explain them one by one; that the bridegroom is the spouse of the church; the wine, the gospel; the old and the new indicates the doctrine of the Pharisees and of Christ; and the rest in the same way.¹ For my own part, I am wont, in explaining allegories, to follow the custom of common life, with which the voice of nature is in unison, and which may be easily estimated from the design and manner of using allegories, fables and similitudes². Would that, in the reading of ancient

¹ See Jerome ad h. l. Opp. IX. p. 27. ed. Erasm. Chrysostomi ad h. l. Homil. p. 361. Gerhardi Harmon. Tom I. p. 729.

² Comp. the dissertation *De causis quibus allegoriarum interpretatio nitur*, Vol. I. p. 370.—The excursus of W. Abr. Teller to Turretin *De interpretatione S. S.* p. 105. J. C. G. Ernesti *de Usu Vitæ communis ad Interpretationem N. T.* Lips. 1779. Lowth on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, Lectures 6th and 7th, with the notes of Michaelis.

authors, the language, opinions, and customs of common life had more frequently been made a rule of interpretation!

If it be true, that all the rules of rhetoric have been derived from nature, and from the observation of nature in common life; still, how shall we ever determine, that what we have learned, is not the opinions of others upon language and style, mere *φιλοσοφούμενα*, instead of that human art itself, which is in unison with common life, unless we have ascertained the agreement of what we have learned with common life and daily experience? If it be true, that whatever book we read, is, as it were, the discourse of some individual addressed to ourselves; can we persuade ourselves that we come to the true sense of the book, if, in reading, we pursue a course directly contrary to what we are accustomed to do in hearing? if we take words in a sense in which no one is accustomed to take them in common life? if we look for mountains in every syllable, when no one ever expects any such thing in the language of common life? if we deny a writer that equity, which is the first law of conversation, viz. to press nothing too far, to judge of a speaker by the same liberal rule which we allow ourselves in speaking; if we suppose that he has written for the purpose of affording us an opportunity of digressing, of indulging the flights of our imagination, and while he is talking of the earth, of wandering away to heaven? Pray let us consider how many errors, how many opinions and difficulties, to take a single example, have been introduced into the ancient poets by such as have undertaken to interpret poems, while they spurned nature, of which common life forms a part. What wisdom has been forcibly obtruded upon Homer, where he breathes nothing but nature and common life! Consider what torture has been practised upon the sacred writers, by such as have well nigh forgotten, that although they wrote under the influence of inspiration, yet they were men, employed human language, and wrote in such a manner, as that by the aid of language their readers could understand them; that is, in such a manner as the genius of the language permitted. It may happen, indeed, that in this way, we shall be thought to possess but a small share of learning, because we do not everywhere declare that what others know, we know too; but, on the other hand, how great will be our satisfaction, if all that is around us, all that is embraced in common life, proclaims that we are in the right, that the truth is as we say and think. It may happen also, that we may seem to be wanting in modesty in our mode of treating

the sacred volume, too liberal, too much given to *καυνολογία*. But how great will be our consolation, if the reasons of our interpretations are founded upon common precepts, which in interpretation have the force of evidence; and not upon such as are at variance with the whole nature and custom of language; like those which Turretin judiciously refutes. Let it not be understood from this that I would condemn logical subtilty to neglect. By no means: for neither can the true doctrine be understood without this, nor can he who has collected ever so many facts, lay claim to the title of learned, unless he knows how to arrange, define, and defend them. And who would desire to be without the advantages of such a logic, by which one is enabled to learn with so much more of certainty, ease, rapidity, clearness, and system? But after we have thus learned, the whole of our acquisitions must be examined by the standard of common life, in order that it may appear what we have learned for ourselves, what for others, what for the school, and what for life.

ART. III. ON THE HYPOTHESIS OF THE EGYPTIAN OR INDIAN ORIGIN OF THE NAME JEHOVAH.

By Professor Tholuck, of Halle. Translated from the German by the Editor *

The reproach has often been brought against the defenders of the scriptural faith, that in their apologetical works they have

* From Tholuck's "Literarischer Anzeiger" for May 1832, No. 27 sq.—The present article is selected as an appropriate and interesting supplement to that on the "Import of the name Jehovah," by Mr Ballantine, in the preceding Number of this work. Besides its intrinsic merits, it presents us with a curious example of the facility with which a convenient polemical error may glide into general currency, without any other foundation than hasty inference, hardy assertion, and the authority of distinguished names.—EDITOR.

paid less regard to the *weight* than to the *number* of their arguments; and that therefore in the production of historical testimony they too often fail in a proper degree of critical skill. This reproach cannot, indeed, be entirely put aside, either in regard to the earlier or more recent apologists;—we are thinking here of Stolberg, whose historical testimonies are only too often *sublestæ fidei*. But that the adversaries have the same reproach to bring against their own party, is a fact not less firmly established. We will not say a word here of Voltaire's well known airy citations, of which we shall adduce below a remarkable example; but even the critical rationalism of Germany cannot acquit itself wholly of the charge of similar want of critical acumen. Among various other proofs of this assertion, the following, which has respect to the origin of the name **JEHOVAH**, may also hold a place.

That the name which God ascribes to himself in the books of Moses, that holy name which the Jew did not dare pronounce, and which the early christian church in general referred to an immediate communication from God himself,—that this name was known in Egypt long before the time of Moses, and was adopted by this lawgiver, with most of his other institutions, from that country, is regarded in our day as a fact so unquestioned and unquestionable, as to have passed already into general currency in the “Conversations-Lexicon;”¹ and seems to many, probably, for this very reason, so much the less susceptible of doubt.

The person who brought this opinion into such general circulation, is alas! one of our classic writers—it is Schiller,—who, in his essay on the *Mission of Moses*,² has narrated in a manner not less superficial than insolent, the history of the lawgiver of Israel,—the history of him to whom the Redeemer of the world appeals, as a witness for himself. In this essay, the Egyptian origin of the name Jehovah is spoken of as a fact no longer requiring any proof; it is directly presupposed.—That treatises like this, under the sanction of a name which for Germany is so

¹ ART. JEHOVAH. The “Conversations-Lexicon” exhibits here, as elsewhere, the wise reserve of “not meaning to determine” how much was borrowed by Moses from Egypt; but the name Jehovah, at least, was certainly known there. [The article here referred to is incorporated into the *Encyclopaedia Americana*.]—ED.

² *Die Sendung Moses*, first printed in *Thalia*, 10ten Heft.

imposing, should come into circulation in thousands and ten thousands of copies, and thus determine the views of the great mass of the public, is greatly to be deplored; and so much the more in the present case, since this essay, apart from its irreligious spirit, is as wholly destitute of any scientific character and of any fundamental knowledge of the subject, as any thing that Voltaire ever wrote. However highly, therefore, we may appreciate the talent of an author; yet talent without study, on subjects which demand a real and profound acquaintance with the facts of the case, can of necessity build only on the sand.

But in regard to the present essay, the leading ideas of it do not even belong to Schiller himself; for he admits at the close, that he borrowed them from the book of Brother Decius on the Hebrew Mysteries. Now as to this book, we need only know the history of its origin, in order to judge of the learning contained in it, and of its *fides* in general. The author of this little work, which made a great noise in its day, was the celebrated Reinhold.¹ It appeared at the time when *freemasonry* was in its most flourishing state; and when in the twofold direction which it took, the mystic-crypto-catholic and the illuminative,² it had got possession of some of the noblest minds of Germany. The attempt was now made to represent even Jesus as the pupil of some secret school, as of the Essenes, or of the Egyptian priests.³ Reinhold also, who had been trained by the Jesuits, had already become in Vienna a zealous freemason; and had thus escaped but a short time from his former mental slavery in that city, before he came out with the juvenile attempt⁴ to represent Moses as the pupil of mysteries, and even as the primeval founder of the [Hebrew] lodge, so celebrated in those days.⁵ The very object of this work would of itself lead us to anticipate any thing rather than deep and learned investigation;

¹ Prof. of Philosophy at Jena, and afterwards at Kiel; born at Vienna 1758, died 1823.

² The former prevailed in Berlin, Holstein, Hamburg; the latter was exemplified by Weishaupt in Bavaria, and by Barth.

³ Kästner's *Agape*; see Heubner zu Reinhard's Plan Jesu, p. 122, and App. III.

⁴ First printed in the *Wiener Maurerjournal*, long before it was published in Leipsic; see Reinhold's *Leben*, p. 25.

⁵ Die Hebräischen Mystereien oder die älteste religiöse Freimaurerei. In zwey Vorlesungen etc. von Bruder Decius. Leipzig 1788.

and in point of fact such investigation was impossible for a young man in his circumstances, educated as a Jesuit, and entangled in a hundred philosophical and belles-lettres projects. The Greek writers are cited by him mostly in the Latin versions; and where not, Brother Decius had the works of Warburton, Spencer, etc. before him. — Such is the source from which the great German poet, himself at that time zealous for the opinions of the league, has drawn his materials.

In the work of Reinhold, the Egyptian origin of the name Jehovah is spoken of as a well known fact; and the only historical document referred to, is the inscription on the temple of Isis: "I am all that was, is, or shall be."¹ So also Schiller. But Brother Decius does not in this respect even follow out his own suggestion; he introduces to us a high guarantee, Monsieur Voltaire, who says:² "The most sacred name among the Egyptians was the same which the Hebrews afterwards adopted into their language, viz. *I-ha-ho*. This was pronounced in various ways; and Clemens Alexandrinus assures us in his *Stromata*, that no one might enter the temple of Serapis, who did not bear on his breast or on his forehead the name *I-ha-ho*, or *Jao*, which denoted the eternal God." What a remarkable fact of antiquity! But,—if it only could be found in Clement! I have indeed never succeeded in finding it; but confess that I have never given myself much trouble about it; because there was reason to fear beforehand, that it would turn out in respect to this quotation from Clement, *as to which all other writers are silent*, much as it did with the patient German, who tormented himself with Voltaire's quotation from Habakkuk.³ Schiller

¹ See further in the sequel.

² *Sur les Mœurs et l'Esprit des Nations*. As Voltaire expresses himself differently elsewhere, and Br. Decius is very indefinite in his citations, and gives the present one only in German and with an inaccurate title, I at first thought he might have confounded this with the *Esprit du Judaïsme*. But the passage exists, with slight variation, in the section *Rites Egyptiens*, Vol. XVI. p. 100, edit. 1783.

³ The following is the anecdote. Voltaire had quoted at hazard, as he often does, a passage from Habakkuk, which is not to be found there. A profound German *magister* wears himself with searching for it in all the various editions; but as the search is unsuccessful, he thinks it best to ask counsel from the great oracle himself. He appears before Voltaire with deep humility of course, excuses himself, and explains his perplexity: 'Habakkuk could not have said

however has not scrupled to incorporate this story of Voltaire, without further remark, into his essay ; where one reads it in full with astonishment.¹

If we turn now to the theologians, it is known that so early as the beginning of the eighteenth century disputes arose on the question, Whether the religious ceremonies of the Hebrews were borrowed from the Egyptians ; and in what degree the Hebrew rites were dependent on those of Egypt. Besides the English deists, Marsham, in his *Canon Chronicus*, Lond. 1671, raised doubts as to the originality of the Hebrew rites, and especially of circumcision. He was followed by the truly learned Spencer, in his work *de Legibus Hebræorum ritualibus*,² whose object was not, like Marsham's, to raise doubts, but to remove those which had been excited. He admits, as the lively and free-thinking Maimonides had done before, the adoption of most of the rites from Egypt ; and indeed he was the first to prove this with learning. But he regards it only as a wise condescension on the part of God ; while in respect to another portion of the ceremonies he seeks the ground of them in an accommodation to certain heathen religious rites. Similar to the views of Spencer were those of the distinguished Warburton. But there was still wanting, a thorough critical confutation or investigation of this alleged accordance of the Mosaic worship with that of the heathen. There appeared only the *Ægyptiaca* of the learned Witsius, which in the first edition

so and so ; he can find it in no edition, etc. etc.' What answer does he get ? " Monsieur, vous ne connoissez guères ce Habacouc ; ce coquin est capable de tout ! "

¹ *Sämmtliche Werke* B. XVI. p. 74.—A curious example of empty pretension in Voltaire, which Br. Dectus has withheld, occurs in the same article. Voltaire says respecting the name Jehovah, " que les Arabes n'en ont retenu que la syllabe *Hou*, adoptée enfin par les Turcs, qui la prononcent encore avec plus de respect que le mot Allah." How does ignorance confound every thing ! Master Aronet had somehow heard, that the Arabs call God *Hû* ; at once he takes it for granted, this must be the last syllable of *Jehovah* ; and lays it immediately before his readers as an historical fact ! This *Hû*, as is well known, which the Dervises more especially employ, is the pronoun, Heb. *אני*, *αὐτός*, used emphatically. So also *יהוה* is the name of God among the Cabbalists.

² This work first appeared complete, Camb. 1727 ; but the essays were published singly at an earlier period.

were directed against Marsham, and in the second against Spencer also; and we may likewise reckon here the *Dissertatio Preliminaria* of Pfaff's edition of Spencer's work.—It was an acquaintance with the English and French deists, that first rendered these views current in Germany. Even theologians who defended the divine origin of the Mosaic religion, not only derived a great portion of the religious rites and theocratic laws from Egypt; but were also not disinclined to refer back, with Voltaire, the name Jehovah to an Egyptian original.¹ So much the less, therefore, can these views surprise us in theologians like Bauer, Eichhorn, De Wette, Gesenius, etc.

Whether more or less in the Mosaic institutions was borrowed from those of Egypt, is a question which we cannot here discuss; it would require a separate work, because it is only by an examination which shall go into full detail and critically weigh all the circumstances and results, that we can hope to arrive at the truth.² Meanwhile, we will pursue this examination

¹ See Michaelis *Mosaisches Recht*, Th. I. § 4. and Anmerk. zu 2 Mos. 3: 6.

² See Ernesti's review of S. Schmid's *Dissert. de Sacerdotibus Egyptiorum*, Neue theol. Biblioth. X. p. 272. In reference to the fact that this author assumes the accordance of the Hebrew rites with those of Egypt, Ernesti says correctly: "We recommend to our readers the duty of examination, whenever an assertion depends on the application of historical facts; *where every resemblance is not decisive*."—We should here also remark the great difference between those earlier theologians, who directly ascribe to Moses the spirit and the doctrines of his religion, and assume only an accommodation to Egyptian rites and ceremonies,—and those more recent authors, who derive also the spirit and the doctrines of the Mosaic institutions from Egypt; a view which stands in very close connexion with the similar derivation of the name Jehovah. Even the cosmogony of the book of Genesis has been referred back to Egyptian sources! See Dorneddin in Eichhorn's Biblioth. B. X.—Herder, who in his *Geist der hebr. Poesie* wholly follows Spencer in the former respect, nevertheless does not coincide in the latter with the recent theologians. "It is foolish," he says (Th. 2. p. 63. ed. Cotta), "to try to deny, that Moses, in establishing his priesthood, his temple, etc. had no reference to Egypt,—the land where he himself had been trained, and from which he wished to train away his people. The traces of resemblance are indisputable.—But the *spirit* of his religion was not Egyptian. His God was Jehovah, THE GOD OF HIS FATHERS; and even in ceremo-

with reference to a single point, viz. the name of Jehovah. What grounds then are there for the assertion, that this name was derived from Egypt?

Wherever we turn, we find recent theologians and historians¹ speaking of the God *Iaō* of the Egyptians, as of something well known. Now *not one single* ancient writer affirms, that God was called *Iaō* by the Egyptians. Under these circumstances we can only suppose, that a slip of memory has taken place in respect to the celebrated passage in Diodorus Siculus.² In the section, where Diodorus speaks of the Egyptians, he mentions incidentally that *Jews* call their God *Iaō*; and by a fault of memory, it would seem to have been taken for granted, that Diodorus was here speaking of the Egyptians.³—The

nies, he drew his arrangements, like spirit, out of the coarse materials. Whenever there was any thing of superstition, or that had the remotest tendency to idolatry, he laboured at once and directly against the dark spirit of enslaved Egypt."

¹ Even Heeren says: "The name, according to existing historical traces, is Egyptian." Gött. Gelehrt. Anz. 1830. 2 St. p. 12.

² Diod. Sic. I. 94, Παρὰ μὲν γὰρ τοῖς Ἀριμασποῖς Ζαθρανύστην ἱστοροῦσι τὸν ἀγαθὸν δαίμονα προσποιήσασθαι τοὺς νόμους αὐτῷ διδόναι· παρὰ δὲ τοῖς ὀνομαζομένοις Ἰῆταις, τοῖς ἀπαθανατίζουσι, Ζήμον· ὡσαύτως τὴν κοινὴν Ἑστίαν· παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσῆν τὸν Ἰαῶ ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν.

³ Indeed I perceive with astonishment, that Wegscheider, *Institut.* § 52 note d, refers to Diod. Sic. I. 94, without further remark, as an authority to shew that the Egyptians named God *Iaō*! This may indeed be explained by supposing this writer to have borrowed the citation from others, without examining it himself. But Bretschneider, *Dogmat.* I. p. 346. ed. 3, professes to quote the very words of Diodorus thus: ἱστοροῦσι παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσῆν τὸν Ἰαῶ ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν. But what these words mean in this shape, would be a riddle to every one, since after ἱστοροῦσι the verb is omitted on which the accus. Μωσῆν depends, viz. προσποιήσασθαι τοὺς νόμους αὐτῷ διδόναι. When now Diodorus says: "It is related, that among the Jews Moses professed to have received the laws from the god called *Jao*," how could Bretschneider go on and write: "This name (יהוה), as a name of the divine being, was known to the Egyptian priests," and then cite the passage from Diodorus as proof!!—The correct conception and application of the passage is found, among other recent writers, in the treatise of the celebrated orientalist, Abel-Remusat, of which we shall speak more at length in the sequel: *Memoire sur la vie etc. de Lio Tseu*, Par. 1823. p. 46.

passages in ancient writers, where the name 'Iaō occurs, are found best collected in the works noted in the margin.¹ From these it appears, that *two* testimonies of antiquity can be produced, to shew the existence of the name Jehovah or *Jao* beyond the limits of the Mosaic institutions. One of these is in Macrobius, from which, it is alleged, the existence of this name in the Grecian mysteries may be proved;² the other is in Porphyry,³ and goes, it is said, to shew that the name existed among the Phenicians;—with what reason, we shall soon see.

The following is the passage in Macrobius:⁴ *Φράξτε τὸν πάντων ὑπατον θεὸν ἔμμεν' Ιαὼ χεῖματι μὲν τ' αἰδην, Δία δ' εἶαρος ἀρχομένοιο. Ἡέλιον δὲ θέρευς, μεταπώρου δ' ἀβρὸν Ιαῶ.* As to this passage, consisting of verses ascribed in Macrobius to an oracle of Apollo Clarius, Jablonsky has clearly enough shewn,⁵ that they belong to a Judaizing Gnostic; a class of persons among whom the Jewish names of God, 'Iaō and Σεβασθ, were the objects of mystic speculation,⁶ as is shewn by the Abraxas-gems.⁷ But admitting that in the second or third century the name 'Iaō was to be found among the Greeks or Egyptians or the orientals of Western Asia, still one would hardly venture to assume from this circumstance an independent origin of the name among these people; but must in any case regard it as having passed over to them from the Jews.

¹ Potter's Notes to Clemens Alex. *Strom.* V. p. 666. Wesseling on the above passage of Diodorus. Selden *de Diis Syris*, II. 1. Michaelis, *Supplem. ad Lex. Heb.* I. p. 526. Abel-Remusat in his *Memoire sur Lao Tseu*, p. 45.

² So Wegscheider l. c.

³ In Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* I. 6.

⁴ Saturn. c. 18. ed. Gronov. p. 291.

⁵ Pantheon *Ægypt.* II. 6. 5.

⁶ The Ophites [serpent-worshippers, a branch of the Gnostics] applied the name 'Iaō to a planet-spirit, viz. to that of the moon; see Neander's *Gnostiker*, p. 252. As they were Egyptians, this may not improbably be the reason why in Coptic the moon is called *Ioh*. This circumstance might well furnish the supporters of the Egyptian origin of the name Jehovah an opportunity for another bold conjecture, viz. Isis was the goddess of the moon; and it was on her very temple that the inscription above mentioned stood, which has been regarded as a translation of the name Jehovah. Consequently *Jehovah* is equivalent to 'goddess of the Moon!'

⁷ See Rees' *Cyclopaedia*.

We know sufficiently well from Jamblichus, that the syncretic theosophists of that age were accustomed to adopt foreign names of God, and employ them in their incantations; as we likewise find something similar in the magic of the middle ages. Origen informs us, that even the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were current in the mouths of those persons.¹

As to the passage of Sanchoniathon, or more correctly Porphyry, it has been transmitted to us by two of the ecclesiastical

¹ In this connexion we may adduce a piece of intelligence of recent date, according to which the Tetragrammaton (or here Trigrammaton) is found among the Chinese. The account is found in the essay of Abel-Remusat above mentioned, which affords much important information in respect to oriental theology. In the book *Tao-te-king*, written by Lao-Tseu, who according to Chinese accounts lived in the seventh century before Christ, occurs a passage which Abel-Remusat thus translates: "Celui que vous regardez et que vous ne voyez pas, se nomme *J*; celui que vous écoutez et que vous n'entendez pas, se nomme *Hi*; celui que votre main cherche et qu'elle ne peut saisir, se nomme *Wei*. Ce sont trois êtres qu'on ne peut comprendre, et qui, confondus, n'en font qu'un. Celui qui est au-dessus, n'est pas plus brillant; celui qui est au-dessous, n'est pas plus obscur. C'est une chaîne sans interruption qu'on ne peut nommer, qui rentre dans le non-être." Montucci says, *J* (for which however he reads *Khi*) signifies 'living being'; *Hi*, a 'gentle breathing'; *Wei*, 'messenger.' So likewise the Jesuit missionaries. Abel-Remusat asserts that they are wrong; and that these words are in Chinese the names of the letters JHV. He states that according to the Chinese commentator on the passage, JHV denotes *vacuity*; he himself however believes that these three letters are the name Jehovah. How this name could come to the knowledge of Lao-Tseu, whether through Gnostics from Western Asia or from intercourse with the Jews, he leaves undecided. Here now we are treading on ground so wholly uncertain, that we abstain from forming any judgment. Indeed, we are in entire uncertainty as to the correctness of the specified time when Lao-Tseu lived; whether he actually wrote the still existing book *Tao-te-king*; what may be the sense of this obscure passage; whether JHV may not have still other meanings, etc. So much however we must confess, that even according to Abel-Remusat's own version, the passage does not strike us as having reference to only one name of the supreme Being, but rather to *three*, to a sort of trinity, as the Jesuits also have understood it. But if the name Jehovah be really here intended, it may well be derived, as is done by Abel-Remusat himself, from Western Asia. For the present our belief is, that there is here no reference to the Tetragrammaton.

fathers, Theodoret and Eusebius,¹ and is as follows: *Ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων ἀληθέστατα, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς τόποις καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν αὐτῶν τὰ συμφωνότατα, Σαγχουνιάθων ὁ Βηρύτιος, εἰληγώς τὰ ὑπομνήματα παρὰ Ἱερομβάλου τοῦ ἱερέως θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰεωῶ.* That now not merely Voltaire, but many others, and even the latest commentator on this passage, Orelli, could draw from it the inference, that Ἰεωῶ was the name of a god among the heathen, is truly something more than remarkable.² Who does not see that the writer is here speaking of the God of the Jews? Porphyry simply says, that Sanchoniathon gave a true account of the Jewish history; and this, because he received his information from a priest of Ἰεωῶ. To this we may add, that the fragments of the Phœnician historian, exhibit the same relation to the book of Genesis, as a caricature does to the original; and that a very decided reference in them to that book is not to be mistaken. It were much to be desired, that these remarkable fragments, which have passed through so many hands, should be subjected to a more accurate critical examination than that of Orelli, who has contented himself with merely giving *excerpta* from Fabricius and Beck.

So then we find, in support of the general assumption that the name *Jao* existed in the mythology of other ancient nations, and especially of the Egyptians, not a solitary direct testimony in all antiquity. There are still, however, two *data* remaining, by which it is supposed this hypothesis may be at least indirectly established.

The first of these is the inscription on the Saitic temple of Isis, already mentioned, to which Voltaire, Reinhold, Schiller, ³ Mi-

¹ Theodoret. Graec. Affect. Curatio, Disp. II. p. 740. ed. Hal.—Euseb. Praep. Evangel. I. 6.

² Orelli's note runs thus: "Videntur itaque verba τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰεωῶ additamentum esse non Philonis Byblii, nedum Sanchoniathonis, sed ipsius Eusebii, et Hierombalum illum fuisse sacerdotem ignoti alicujus Dei apud Phœnices." This sentence I am as little able to comprehend logically, as grammatically.

³ Michaelis says, Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. p. 525, "Concentus Ægyptiacae inscriptionis et nominis Hebraici manifestus, id unum dubium videri possit, sitne insigne sententiae lumen Ægyptium, atque a Jehova, Moesen mittente, a mortua natura ad creatorem vivum translatum? an imitati suo more Ægyptiis Israelitae, quorum syncretismum jam Hadrianus memoravit, nominis Jehova interpretationem ad suam Isidem transtulerint."

chaëlis, Bauer, De Wette, and Winer,¹ all appeal; and which has been transmitted to us by Plutarch:² *Ἐγὼ εἰμι πάν τὸ γε-γονός καὶ ὄν καὶ ἐσόμενον, καὶ τὸν ἑμὸν πέπλον οὐδεὶς πώ θνη-τός ἀρεκάλυπεν*, *I am all that was, is, and shall be, and my veil no mortal can remove*. Admitting for the present that the inference can be drawn from this inscription, that Isis bore the name Jehovah,—are we even then entitled to assume at once that this name was of such antiquity among the Egyptians, as that the Hebrews must have borrowed it from this people? The opinion is ever becoming more general, that the passage in Ex. 3: 6, is by no means to be understood as implying that the name Jehovah first came into use in the time of Moses. Indeed this had long before been the name of God in the days of Abraham; and God only promises in Exodus, that from this time onward he will manifest himself towards Israel in the attribute which this name implies, as the *immutable* God.³ Even the rationalizing Bauer, who likewise supposes the Egyptians to have known the name *Jao*, cannot forbear admitting that the name Jehovah is older among the Hebrews than the time of Moses, and that for this very reason the Egyptian *Jao* must have been borrowed from the Hebrews.⁴ If the name be actually of earlier date than the time of Moses, and the Egyptians also really had this name, there remains in fact no other supposition.

Besides all this, we must here take into account, how much, or rather how little reliance, is to be placed on the authority of Plutarch, in his accounts of Egyptian antiquities, writing as he did in the second century, in the time of *syncretismus*. Who does not know, how with him later philosophical ideas combine with the ancient accounts? Vogel,⁵ in his critique upon the Greeks who have written on Egypt, remarks: “The best illustration of the Egyptian religion might well have been given us by Plutarch—but unfortunately it was not his object to unfold the religious ideas of the Egyptians themselves; but merely to

¹ In his edition of Simonis Lex. Heb.

² *De Iside* c. g.—The same inscription is also given, with some variation, by Proclus, *Comm. in Tim.* c. I. p. 30. He adds, that it was found in the *adytum* of the temple.

³ See Ewald, *Compos. der Genesis*, p. 8—12. Also among earlier writers, Hottinger *de Nominibus Dei*, Diss. IV. p. 252.

⁴ *Theologie des A. T.* p. 14.

⁵ *Ueber die Religion der Aegypter*, p. 56.

spin out from the Egyptian religion the ideas of his countrymen and his own." And since all other writers upon Egypt make no mention of this inscription,¹ neither Herodotus, nor Diodorus, nor Strabo, the genuineness of it has been, with good reason, called in question by Mosheim, with whom Meiners also coincides.²

But admitting the inscription to be genuine,—how is the conclusion to be justified, that, because it is here said of Isis:³ *I am what was, is, and is to come*, therefore the name Jehovah was known to the Egyptians? The name itself must then be Egyptian; but who will undertake to shew that in the language of ancient Egypt a similar word had this signification? Or if so, how strange the coincidence, that this Egyptian word should again bear exactly the same meaning in Hebrew? Or should it be said that a word of different sound was extant in Egyptian, which Moses only translated into Hebrew,—does then the word Jehovah in Hebrew really mean what the inscription declares? It is now a generally admitted point, that *Jehovah* (יהוה) is written with the vowels of *Adonai* (אדוני). If this be the case, how then can this meaning be drawn from the word, with even an appearance of probability? Or if we regard the present vowels as those which originally belonged to it, who in our day would assent to the old interpreters, according to whom the first syllable י marks future time; the second הו (for particip. הוה) present time; and the third ה (the praeter) past time. Even among the cabbalists this view of the word seems not to have been regarded strictly as an interpretation; but rather as a piquant expression of its meaning.⁴ So also the passage Rev. 1: 4, 8, is to be regarded.

¹ With the single exception of the New-Platonist Proclus, as mentioned in a preceding note; but he is of no authority.

² In his work *de vero Deo*, p. 32, Meiners says: "Ad inscriptionem quod attinet, non possum non Mosheimii partibus me adjungere, qui fictam illam ac commentitiam esse multis victricibus rationibus demonstravit, inter quas illa mihi omnium firmissima esse videtur, quod hujus inscriptionis neque Herodotus ac Plato, neque etiam Strabo et Diodorus, meminerint."

³ Plutarch says, "in the temple of *Minerva*, who is regarded by some as Isis." Elsewhere *Neith* is *Minerva*; but *Neith* and *Isis* often coincide in the Egyptian mythology.

⁴ E. g. in the book *Jezira*, ed. Rittangel, p. 50.—So afterwards the Targum of Jerusalem, Ex. 3: 14, *qui fuit est et erit dixit mundo*; and Targ. Jon. Deut. 32: 39.

But after all, is there not another interpretation of the inscription in question, a thousand times more obvious than this strange one? Admitting still its genuineness, does not the explanation of it from the character of Isis in the Egyptian mythology present itself to our very hands? Isis, called also *Mwûth*, *mother*, is there the source of all things, the mother of the world.¹ Especially is she so represented by the later syncretistic philosophers, e. g. by Apuleius; and hence the supposition derives still more probability, that the Saitic inscription had its origin in some syncretistic New-Platonic workshop. Who does not recollect very similar pantheistic expressions respecting *Zeus* in the Orphic hymns, which likewise sprung from the New-Platonist school? Compare also the prayer which Pausanias adduces from an earlier age:² *Zeûs ἦν· Zeûs ἐστὶ· Zeûs ἔσσεται· ὦ μεγάλη Zeῦ*. Pantheistic India has also similar expressions; e. g. Krishna says of himself:³ "My spirit is the guardian of all that exists. Know that all things are in me; just as the air, which pervades all, remains still contained in the space of ether. At the end of the Kalpa, all will again return into my root; and I shall create it again."

It is perhaps superfluous further to remark, that if the Egyptians in their mysteries really possessed a purer knowledge of God, this would have been connected with the primeval spirit *Kneph*, and not with Isis. Meiners, who asserts in opposition to Jablonsky, that the Egyptians had no intelligent spiritual deities, is probably least of all correct in regard to *Kneph*.

From every consideration, then, we obtain the result, that, while there is no *direct* proof of the Egyptians having had the name *Jao* in their language, there can be none with any propriety drawn *indirectly* from the Saitic inscription.

There is however still another *datum* extant, which has been supposed indirectly to establish the supposition in question. We find in a book written after the christian era, in the treatise *Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*, the following somewhat enigmatical passage: *Ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑμνοῦσι διὰ τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ φωνηέντων οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἐφεξῆς ἡχοῦντες αὐτά. Καὶ ἀντὶ αὐλοῦ καὶ ἀντὶ κιθάρας τῶν γραμμάτων τούτων ὁ ἦχος ἀκούεται ὑπὲρ εὐφωνίας, ὥστε ὁ ἐξαιρῶν τὴν σύγκρουσιν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ μέλος ἀτεχνῶς ἐξαιρεῖ τοῦ*

¹ Görres *Mytheng.* p. 401. Creuzer's *Symbolik*, I. p. 519 sq.

² Phoc. X. 12.

³ Bhavagat Gita, by Wilkins, p. 72.

λόγου καὶ μοῦσαν. This obscure passage was early taken as referred to the name Jehovah. Scaliger was in doubt, whether the ἐπὶ φωνήεντα were intended to designate יהוה, or Serapis; since Hesychius in a gloss speaks of τὸ ἐπιταγύμνατον Σαραπίς. Fuller afterwards proposed to arrange the vowels thus: *IE(H) O(O) TA*, considering the long vowels as included in the short ones. Against this view, L. Capell took a decided stand.¹ Matthias Gesner, the great philologist, thought he had more successfully solved the riddle, by so arranging the seven Greek vowels as to bring out the full name *IEHΩOTA*.² After the appearance of Gesner's dissertation, theologians felt themselves authorized to appeal to it as a certain proof of the existence of the name Jehovah among the Egyptians. So Michaelis,³ Bauer, De Wette, and many others. Gesenius, though he expresses himself with more caution, also says of it: ⁴ "A happy conjecture! though hardly any thing more. In that case the name, which moreover does not sound Shemitic, would be of Egyptian origin." If, however, the grounds already adduced in favour of its Egyptian origin have been found untenable, the same is true in no less measure of the one here presented.

We ask, first, who gives us this account, and out of what period does it come? Here again we find ourselves at once in perplexity. That the Demetrius, to whom the book is ascribed, was Demetrius Phalereus, no one would now affirm. But let us assign the author to an age ever so early,—with Gale, Gesner, Harles, under the emperor Antoninus; or, with Valesius, even under Augustus,—still we have here an account flowing from a period, when the Egyptian worship was already remodeled under the influence of *syncretismus*; and it can surely never be a valid conclusion, that what is related to us of the Egyptian priests in an age after Christ, holds good also of those with whom Moses or Abraham had to do several thousand years before. It may indeed be shewn to be more probable, that the custom of the Egyptian priests here mentioned by Demetrius,

¹ See the collection, *Decas Dissertat. philol. de vera pronuntiatione nominis Jehova*, ed. H. Relandus, Traj. 1707, containing dissertations by Drusius, Amama, Capell, and Fuller. That of Drusius is the most full.

² Comm. Soc. Gott. ad an. 1751. T. I.

³ Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. I. p. 726. Orient. Biblioth. XI. p. 19.

⁴ In his larger Heb. Germ. Lex. I. p. 372.

was actually introduced in one of the centuries subsequent to the christian era. But before proceeding to this, we ask further,—and we do it with astonishment that no one has ever before raised the question,—can it then be really inferred from this account, that the *name* of God, and especially of *one* God, was thus chanted? The words run: “The priests chant praises to the *gods*, (in the plural,—they could not all have the same name,) by means of the seven vowels.” Does not this lead rather to the supposition, that the mere recitation or chanting of certain tones was employed as a substitute for hymns? In fact, we are informed, that down to a late period in the Egyptian schools, the vowels were recited or chanted off with the tones which were assigned to them as notes.¹

That this is indeed the correct interpretation of the passage before us, is strikingly confirmed by the explanation recently given by Otfried Müller,² of a Milesian inscription formerly illustrated by Barthelemy,³ Kopp, and others. This Milesian inscription contains the invocation of a god, who, in a formula five times repeated, is designated by the seven vowels arranged in their usual succession, but commencing each time differently; e. g. *Αἰνῶνα, Εἰνῶνα, Ηἰνῶναε, Ινῶναεη, Ουνῶναεηι*. Each group of vowels is preceded by *ἄγιε*, and the whole is followed by the closing words: *ἀρχαγγέλοις φυλάσσεται ἡ πόλις Μιλησίων καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες*. Müller recurs first to the meaning of the vowels among the ancients; according to which they denoted the seven planets.⁴ This Gale and Jablonsky had before suggested. He then mentions as the most probable supposition, that the vowels here denote the seven tones of the octave; and these seven tones are identified with the seven planets and the seven planetary spirits;—we would rather say, that praises were chanted to the seven planetary spirits in the mystical number seven of the tones.⁵—It is easy to perceive how this in-

¹ Didymi Rudim. Lit. Copt.

² In a review of Soldan's Dissertation, *Rerum Milesiarum Comm. I.*

³ Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript. T. XLI. p. 516.

⁴ See Dionysius Thrax, in Bekker *Anecdol.* II. p. 796.

⁵ Another example how easy it is to prove every thing from any thing, when one suffers himself to be led astray by accidental resemblances, is furnished by Adair, in his remarkable book, *The History of the North American Indians*, Lond. 1775. He communicates to us the discovery, that the Indians in like manner are acquainted with the

scription serves clearly to illustrate the passage in Demetrius. And now in what age are we to place this Milesian inscription? Müller supposes, on philological grounds, that it belongs to the latest age of heathenism. At any rate it must come from an age, when oriental theosophy had become prevalent. This is indicated at once by the mystical play upon the name, so wholly in accordance with the spirit of that age; and especially by the ἀρχάγγελοι. Similar to this are mystic verses in Eusebius;¹ compare also the oracle quoted by Porphyry, where Apollo calls himself βασιλεὺς τῆς ἐπταθόγγου, ὃν πάντες ἴσασιν.²

The attempt to prove the *Egyptian* origin of the word Jehovah, must consequently be wholly given up.—Meanwhile, both in earlier and in more recent times, the similarity of sound which exists between the Hebrew Jehovah and the Latin *Jovis*, has excited the attention of many scholars; and has thus given occasion to new conjectures as to the foreign origin of the former name.

This resemblance, as we have said, occupied the attention of earlier theologians; but they, as was to be expected, drew from it the opposite conclusion, viz. that the Latins had derived their name of God from the Hebrews; although L. Capell, in contesting this opinion against Fuller, says: “Non facile persuaserim, Deum voluisse, eo usque Satanae laxare habenas.” Even Voltaire himself derives the Latin *Jovis* from the Hebrew name, and not the reverse.³ But recent theologians and mythologists have viewed the matter differently. According to Buttmann,

name Jehovah; and in fact, his inference is precisely of the same character as that of Gesner and the theologians who have followed in his steps. He says, p. 46, 47, “They approach stooping with their heads and bodies pretty low, saying in a bass key, *Yah*, quite short; then they retreat backward etc. and sing in a strong bass key the awful monosyllable *O*, for the space of a minute; then they strike up majestic *He*, in the treble; and in a bass key they at last utter the strong, mysterious sound, *Wah*. — The notes together compose their sacred mysterious name *Y-O-He-Wah*,— which seems to be the true Hebrew pronunciation of the name Jehovah.” Hence these Indians belong to the lost ten tribes of Israel.* Q. E. D. — Comp. Michaelis, Orient. Biblioth. XI. p. 18.

¹ Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* lib. XI. c. 6.

² *Ib.* lib. V. 14.

³ Dict. Philosoph. sub. v. *Jéova*. Here is to be consulted particularly, Selden *de Diis Syris*, Synt. I.

who of all the moderns has been the most arbitrary and the most unfortunate in his attempts at mythologizing the Mosaic records, not only are *Jehovah* and *Jovis* the same word, but also *Japheth* and *Janus*; ¹ and De Wette also says: ² "In my opinion the affinity of *Jehovah* and *Jovis* is decisive against the derivation of יהוה from יהיה. Both names have a more ancient and deeper origin; and *Jehovah* was probably just as much a proper name as *Jupiter*."

By the "deeper origin" here alluded to, is probably meant the language of Eastern Asia, which it is customary to regard as the nursery whence have sprung the languages of Western Asia, and consequently the Hebrew. From these eastern Asiatic languages, we can indeed derive both the Greek and Hebrew names of God, in the following manner. The earlier name of *Jovis* is, according to Varro, ³ *Diovis*; this coincides with *Deus*, and *Deus* corresponds to the Greek *Zeús*, whom the Cretans called *Æús*. If now we look for the origin of *Zeús*, *θεός*, in Eastern Asia, we find first the Persian *dev*, and farther back, the Indian *devas*, derived from *div*, 'heaven,' and signifying 'the heavenly.' Indeed we can, with a modern Chinese scholar, ⁴ go back still further to the Chinese language, where *thian* is 'heaven,' and *thi*, 'the heavenly,' i. e. God. As now out of the ancient *Diovis* and *Diespiter* were formed *Jovis* and *Jupiter*, so the *d* must in like manner have been dropped from the beginning of *Jehovah*. Instances of similar abrasion may be adduced both in ancient and modern languages; in Sanscrit *dvi* 'two,' and *vinsati* 'twenty;' compare *duo* and *vigin-ti*, *zwei* and *beide*; *is*, *this*, and *dieser*; *giorno*, *jour*, and *di-urnus*, etc.

We do not doubt but that the derivation which we have here given, will be welcome to many, and will appear to them easy and natural. But nowhere, and especially in the comparison of languages, must one rest satisfied with first appearances, with the mere similarity of like-sounding words. We choose to adduce here an appropriate proof of this, before proceeding further in

¹ Ueber den Mythos von Noahs Söhnen, *Mythologus*, I. p. 224.

² Beiträgen, Th. II. p. 183.

³ De Lingua Lat. lib. V. 20.

⁴ Kurz, in Nouv. Journal Asiatique, Juin 1830.

our subject. It has become customary, among the very many and remarkable coincidences of the Persian and German languages, to adduce also the name of God ;¹ which in German is *Gott*, in modern Persian *choda*. What words could sound more alike? But how many difficulties present themselves against the comparison, when we look closer at either the German or Persian appellation? The modern Persian has its immediate source in the Zend. In the Zend language, God is called *kuadâta*, i. e. 'a se datus,' compounded of *kua* and *data*; in Sanscrit *svayamdata*, i. e. 'the originator of his own existence.' If now *choda* is thus only a contraction of two words, if the verb *to give* is thus contained in it, who can think of comparing it with the German *Gott*? although at first view the analogy seems to be very close.²

In respect now to the comparison of *Jehovah* or *Jahaveh* or *Jahvoh*, (for we will here nota attempt to decide on the original vowels,) with the Latin *Jovis*, or, to go back to the ultimate root, with the Sanscrit *devas*, it has been customary, in order to bring them into nearer juxtaposition, to adopt the Greek orthography, as it has been transmitted to us by Diodorus and Theodoret, viz. *Ἰαῶ*. In this however the guttural sound is wanting; because the Greeks do not in general express ה nor even ח in their orthography. But this ה must not be overlooked. If it was not extant in the Indian, Persian, nor Greek, how came the Hebrews to insert it? This ה alone is sufficient to deter us from such a comparison of the two words. To this we may add, that the יהוה, as derived from the root יהי, has in Hebrew

¹ So all, from Salmasius onward, who have touched upon the affinity of the Persian and German, as Le Pileux, Murray, von Hammer; also Dorn, who has recently treated of this affinity in the most accurate manner, in his work *Ueber die Verwandtschaft des Persischen and Germanischen Sprachstamms*, Hamb. 1827. p. 170.—Kanne also very naturally brings together *Gott* and *choda*. But from what he (Kanne) tells us about these names, in his book: *Erste Urkunde der Geschichte*, p. 579 sq. we learn also many other things, viz. 1) That the name *Jehovah* is really the same with the Coptic *Io*, i. e. Moon-goddess, Moon-cow; 2) That the Berlin mode of pronouncing *Yott* for *Gott*, may lay claim to a high antiquity; since the word *Gott* is the letter *Iota*; 3) That the name *Jehovah* was originally יי; which however, as is well known, is merely the rabbinic abbreviation.

² Comp. Burnouf, *Extrait d'un Commentaire etc.* in *Nouv. Journal Asiatique*, 1829, T. III. p. 344 sq.

a form belonging to the analogy of proper names, and also an entirely appropriate meaning. If we point it as most do, יהוה, it is a noun after the analogy of יִצְחָק, and signifies 'the inimitable.'—Besides all this, the question might still be raised, whether in the ancient Hebrew language, perhaps as early as the time of Abraham, (on the supposition that the passage in Ex. 6: 3 does not refer to a later introduction of the name,) we are at liberty to assume such an abrasion of the *d* at the beginning of the word; while the less ancient Greek, and even the Latin in its *Deus* and *Diespiter*, have faithfully preserved it.

In general, in the comparison of Hebrew words with foreign ones, we must, I think, hold fast to the following principle: If a Hebrew name is regularly derived from a Hebrew root, so that it is obviously only the abstract idea of the verb expressed as a noun, and arises from the verb as the stem from the root; there is nothing gained by merely comparing it with a like-sounding word of another language, so long as the ultimate verbal roots are not shewn to be related to each other. Thus the substantives אָנוּשׁ and אִישׁ contracted from אָנַשׁ certainly resemble in sound the German *Mensch* (mennisko), Sanscrit *manuscha*. But if now the Sanscrit word, and probably the German also, falls back upon the verbal root *man*, 'to think, to be strong;' while the Hebrew comes from אָנַשׁ, 'to be weak;' the comparison must remain untenable, so long as it is not shown that there is some affinity between these verbs. I have dwelt more on this point in another place.¹

Thus then we have endeavoured to show, that at least the attempts hitherto made to give to the Hebrew name of God a derivation different from that which the earliest Hebrew records themselves present, viz. from the verb יהוה, are untenable. We leave it to other inquirers, as Von Meyer and Sack, who have written on the signification of the divine names, to investigate the form and signification of the word in question, from the Hebrew. We subjoin a single remark. When De Wette says:² "A name so abstract as this would be, if derived from יהוה, is inappropriate for the national name of a God;" and when other recent theologians, following De Wette, likewise find the name too abstract for those early ages,—this all rests merely on an hypothesis, which is false in a twofold respect. First, that Je-

¹ Beiträge zur Sprachklärung des N. T. p. 66 sq.

² Beiträge, Th. II. p. 182.

hovah was only the national God; compare what Von Cölln has brought forward against this hypothesis.¹ Secondly, it is assumed, that in the infancy of nations, rudeness alone is the characteristic of their knowledge, of their ideas, and of their language! To this we reply, in the words of Wagner:² "The hypothesis of an aboriginal rudeness, which raised itself by degrees to a state of cultivated reason, stands in contradiction to the religious origin of mankind,—an origin announced by the prevalence and preponderance of the intellectual principle, as well as by the invention of language, of writing, of profound astronomical calculations, etc."—What can these critics, moreover, say to the fact, that in the Zendavesta the name of God, as we have seen, is, 'He who has produced himself;' and to this corresponds, in Sanscrit, the oft repeated name of God, *svayambhu*, 'the self-existing.' If now in these troubled channels of primeval revelation, a conception so abstract and so spiritual of the divine Being has been able to maintain itself; how can the possibility of it be denied in that purer stream of divine communications, which flows throughout the Hebrew theocracy?

ART. IV. ON THE TIME OF OUR LORD'S LAST PASSEOVER AND CRUCIFIXION.

By J. H. Rauch, Pastor at Alkersleben in Schwarzburg-Sonderhausen. Translated from the German by the Editor.*

It is well known that, among modern interpreters, there reigns great uncertainty and confusion in regard to the exact chronology of this section of the gospel history. It is even asserted,

¹ In his dissertation: *Ueber die Theokratie*, in Wachler's *Philomatie*, Th. III. p. 215 sq.

² Germ. translation of Murray, p. 7.

* From the "Theol. Studien u. Kritiken," 1832. 3tes Heft.

that the evangelists themselves do not harmonize in their accounts. Yet among the ancient teachers of the church we find no trace, that they felt any difficulty in respect to these accounts; or were at all uncertain as to the time when Jesus celebrated the last passover with his disciples, and afterwards suffered. Indeed the Easter controversy, in the earliest period of the church, manifestly shews, that on this point the eastern and western churches were entirely of one opinion. Since now it very clearly appears from the synoptical narrative of the gospels, that the last passover of which our Lord partook with his disciples, was not merely a commemorative repast (*μνημονικόν*), but a real paschal meal (*θύσιμον*); it was assumed by many, as is still done by Kuinoel, in order to bring about the desired harmony in the gospels, that Jesus with a portion of the Jews partook of the paschal lamb one day earlier than the rest of the Jews;—an hypothesis, which, besides being destitute of all historical grounds, does not remove all the difficulties which are supposed to exist in the accounts in question. And as even Mosheim acknowledged his inability to come to a decision on the point; and Semler was disposed to pass it by, as being of too little importance to be worth the trouble of further investigation; and various other attempts of learned theologians have produced no better results; it is not surprising, that De Wette and Winer should at last declare, that to harmonize the accounts of the evangelists respecting this history, is impossible; or that the former, especially, should find in the narrative of the fourth gospel a very important variation, which renders even its genuineness doubtful. It is doubtless true, that the fourth gospel has contributed its share to produce this uncertainty and confusion; but without any fault of its own. Indeed interpreters would never have remained so long in darkness, and at last proceeded to this desperate conclusion, had they been disposed to follow the clear intimations of this evangelist, with confidence in him as an apostle and eye-witness; had they remembered that as an apostle and a native of Palestine, John has spoken of an annual and well-known religious institution of his people, in the common and familiar language of ordinary life; and had they therefore taken pains to ascertain the actual signification of his expressions, which was current at the time.

It was however quite natural in Bretschneider, to whom on other grounds the fourth gospel was already an object of suspicion, and who could place confidence only in the first three,

that, proceeding on the supposition of an entire disharmony of the gospels in this section, and adopting the common views in respect to this history and likewise the meanings commonly attributed to single expressions, he too should find in the narrative of John nothing but gross errors; which, however, he felt himself able to remove, by aid derived from Alexandria, and from the ancient manner of reckoning the different periods of the day. He asserts:¹ "In the fourth gospel, in the account given of the last passover of Jesus, there exists a two-fold contradiction. The first is, that Jesus partook of the meal on the day *before* the festival; and on the next following day, i. e. on the *first day of the festival*, which was the day of *preparation* (παράσκευῇ) for the passover-meal (John 18: 28), he was crucified, and consequently did not partake of the paschal lamb; while the other evangelists relate, that Jesus came to Jerusalem and partook of the paschal lamb on the *first day of the festival* or ἐν τῇ παράσκευῇ τοῦ πάσχα, and then was crucified on the following day, after partaking of the paschal supper, and consequently ἐν τῇ παράσκευῇ τοῦ σαββάτου.—The second contradiction is, that according to the fourth gospel, c. 18: 28, comp. 13: 1, the crucifixion took place on the *fourteenth* day of the month Nisan, on the παράσκευῇ τοῦ πάσχα, and the *Jews had not yet eaten the paschal lamb*; while at the same time it is related, c. 19: 31, that the death of Jesus occurred on the παράσκευῇ τοῦ σαββάτου, that on the next day the sabbath was to be kept, and consequently Jesus suffered on the *fifteenth* day of Nisan."

Without stopping to scrutinize further this by no means satisfactory array of proofs, let us examine the history itself; from which we shall soon learn not only the truth and the deserts of the fourth gospel, but also the causes of the obscurity and variation which critics have so long found in the accounts of this evangelist; and likewise the source from which the author of the *Probabilia* has extracted the contradictions which he professes to have discovered in this part of the fourth gospel.

First of all, however, we will endeavour to gain some clear ideas and establish some fixed principles, according to which the accounts of the four evangelists on this point of history are to be understood and estimated.

What then does Moses first direct in regard to the passover?

¹ Probabilia de Evang. Joh. Apost. Indole et Origine, p. 104.

Lev. 23: 5 sq. "On the fourteenth day of the first month (Nisan), between the evenings, is the Lord's passover;" and **v. 6.** "On the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord; seven days ye must eat unleavened bread."

V. 7. "In the first day ye shall have a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein."

V. 8. "But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days: in the seventh day is a holy convocation, ye shall do no servile work."

The same statute is repeated, almost in the same words, **Num. 28: 16 sq.**

In this law, two days are definitely distinguished, and for each a particular meal is appointed. The *fourteenth* day is not the festival, nor even the first day of the festival, but the passover. The *fifteenth* day is the festival, which is to be holy, the festival of unleavened bread, when for seven days unleavened bread was to be eaten. On the *fourteenth*, the paschal lamb was to be eaten; and from the *fifteenth* onward, unleavened bread, for seven days.

In strict accordance with this law, the succession of days and of the different meals is historically described in **Josh. 5: 10 sq.** The children of Israel held the passover on the fourteenth day of the month at evening, **v. 10**; and on the fifteenth day, "the morrow after the passover," they ate of the corn of the land, unleavened bread and parched ears, **v. 11.**¹

What then is *πάσχα*? According to the above, it signifies not only the paschal lamb, which was killed and eaten on the fourteenth; but also the festival connected with it, which began on the fifteenth, and with which began the seven days on which unleavened bread was to be eaten. Hence, therefore, *πάσχα* is in the gospels the general name for both these days and also the days following the fifteenth or the festival; **Luke 2: 41.** **John 2: 13, 23. 6: 4. 11: 55, 56.** Josephus likewise, whenever he has occasion to speak of these days, so important to his nation, commonly subjoins the explanation: "The festival of unleavened bread, which is called *Pascha*, passover;"²—coinciding entirely with **Luke 22: 1**, "The feast of unleavened bread, which is called the passover." The name *passover*,

¹ For an illustration of this 'parched corn,' see *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. III. p. 643.—*Ed.*

² *Jos. Ant.* 17. 9. 3. *B. J.* 2. 1. 3. *al.*

then, was applied more particularly to the *festival*; the first (fourteenth) day belonged indeed to the passover, but strictly speaking made no part of the proper festival; and hence Josephus sometimes reckons only seven, and sometimes eight days, to the passover. This first day, in accordance with the purpose to which it was devoted, is called "the day of unleavened bread when the paschal lamb must be killed," Luke 22: 7; and "the first day of unleavened bread, ἡ πρώτη τῶν ἄζύμων," Mark 14: 12. Matt. 26: 17. In a special sense, however, πάσχα signifies the *paschal lamb*, the *paschal supper*, whenever these are spoken of, and not the day on which the repast was held; Matt. 26: 17, 18, 19. Mark 14: 12, 14, 16. Luke 22: 7. Jos. Ant. 3. 10. 5.

But the chief question is, When? at what hour of the fourteenth day of Nisan was the paschal lamb eaten? The author of the *Probabilia* asserts: "The lamb was eaten from the last hour of the fourteenth onward, and in the first hours of the fifteenth day of Nisan;" and still more definitely: "The paschal day or the fifteenth day of the month Nisan began, according to our way of speaking, from the sixth hour at evening of Thursday, and the paschal meal was immediately held in the beginning of this day."¹

In the first of these citations, the author still leaves to the fourteenth of Nisan a little honour; but in the second, he assumes without scruple the fifteenth as the day of the paschal meal, the statute of Moses to the contrary notwithstanding. No wonder; for all recent interpreters are of the same opinion, Paulus, Kuinoel, etc. down to the very latest commentators on this part of the gospel history, Guerike and Tholuck.² The judgment given by Paulus is remarkable; it is confident, and yet seems to rest only on authority:³ "The first day of the passover began after sunset of the fourteenth of Nisan; and the paschal lamb was eaten *in the night* between the fourteenth and fifteenth days of this month. Of this there is no longer any doubt. J. D. Michaelis claims to have rectified this point in the most conclusive manner."⁴ In this confidence he now speaks also of the

¹ Probabilia, p. 102. p. 106.

² Guerike in Winer's Neue Krit. Journ. B. 3. St. 3. Tholuck in his Comm. zu. Johannis. [So also Alshausen.]

³ Comm. III. p. 533.

⁴ In his *Mos. Recht*, Michaelis appeals to an article by himself in the *Gött. Anzeigen*, 1758, St. 135. p. 1276.

fifteenth day of Nisan as the day of Jesus' death, the preparation for the sabbath, which began the evening before at sunset, when our Lord partook of the paschal lamb,—and as the first and most solemn day of the feast!!¹

And yet it is this opinion, as I believe, which so utterly disturbs the chronology of this section of the gospel history, and produces such an unavoidable disharmony in the accounts of the evangelists; so that both De Wette and Winer have felt authorized according to this view to affirm:² “The contradiction in the evangelical accounts we can neither disguise, nor hope to solve.” But these accounts stand in most perfect harmony; as we shall now see.

The Jews reckoned their day from sunset to sunset. According to Lev. 23: 5 and Num. 9: 3, the passover was to be celebrated on the fourteenth day of Nisan *between the evenings*,³ between the preceding and following day, i. e. at the moment of sunset, when the new or fourteenth day began. Had the law referred to the *close* of the fourteenth day, this would have implied the beginning of the fifteenth; the fourteenth would mean nothing; the fourteenth would be the fifteenth, and this again the sixteenth, and so on; there would be no chronology in the whole Jewish history. But where in the whole world was there ever a celebration, fixed to take place on a certain definite day, which was held only in the very last moments of that day, or in such a manner as to fall not only mostly, but wholly, within the following day? The incorrectness of this opinion is rendered most strikingly palpable, by a comparison of the statute in respect to the passover, in Deut. 16: 6, “Thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even, at the going down of the sun.” Here, according to the opinion in question, the fourteenth day is not to be thought of, because at sunset the new or following day was already begun; the fifteenth day is here clearly indicated, although according to the express statute not this, but the fourteenth was to be the first paschal day. At the beginning, therefore, and

¹ Comment. p. 78, 79.

² De Wette, Hebr. Jud. Alterth. p. 261. Winer Realwörtub. p. 508.

³ The Jews reckoned two evenings, the first from about the ninth hour till sunset; and the second after sunset; See the Lexicons, and Gesen. Lex. Heb. art. ערב. Calmet art. *Evening*. Comp. Matt. 14: 15, with verse 23.—Ed.

not at the end of the fourteenth day, was the paschal lamb to be killed and eaten ; as the testimony of Josephus shews incontrovertibly. "God commanded Moses," he says, "to direct the people to have a lamb in readiness on the thirteenth [some read *tenth*] of Nisan, against the fourteenth." This Moses did, and ἐνστασης δὲ τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης, which can well mean only, as the fourteenth day began, they killed the lamb.¹ He speaks just as clearly, though not so definitely in another place : "On the fourteenth of Nisan, we celebrate yearly, according to custom, the paschal meal in companies, in such a way that nothing of the victim remains over till the next morning, εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν sc. ἡμέραν ; and then on the fifteenth day, the passover is followed by the festival of unleavened bread."² As now the Jews began the new day at sunset, this fifteenth day of course, which followed the preceding one (τὴν ἐπιούσαν), must also have begun at sunset ; and from the time of eating the lamb on the fourteenth up to this fifteenth, on which the festival immediately followed (διαδέχεται), a full day must have intervened, i. e. the paschal meal must have been held at the beginning of the fourteenth of Nisan.

Josephus states also,³ that the paschal lambs were killed in the afternoon between the ninth and eleventh hour, or according to our way of reckoning, between 3 and 5 o'clock nearly ; and, consequently, just in that interval which, on the day before the sabbath, was regarded as the παρασκευὴ τοῦ σαββάτου. But if the fourteenth of Nisan were now already past, and the paschal meal was first held at the close of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth, it is not easy to see why the Jews, in slaughtering such an immense number of lambs, which Josephus states at 256,000, should have limited themselves to so few hours of time, in which it is almost inconceivable that they could have completed the labour ;—especially as they had had the whole fourteenth day before them, and could at least appropriate the whole afternoon to that purpose. It is therefore in the highest degree probable, that this interval from the 9th to the 11th hour, 3 to 5 o'clock, is to be understood of the *thirteenth* of Nisan, when the

¹ Jos. Ant. 2. 14. 6.

² Jos. Ant. 3. 10. 5,—πέμπτη δὲ καὶ δεκάτῃ διαδέχεται τὴν τοῦ πάσχα ἢ τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτή.

³ Jos. B. J. 6. 9. 3.

paschal lamb was to be held in readiness against the fourteenth.¹ We must also here not forget, that the days [of the month] among the Jews were reckoned, not by the sun, but according to the appearance of the moon; and hence Josephus, in speaking of a day, often subjoins *κατὰ σελήνην*. The fourteenth of Nisan then was the time when the moon appeared and shone for the fourteenth time in Nisan; hence he calls the night in which, after the first paschal meal, God passed by the Israelites and smote the Egyptians, *ἐκείνη ἡ νύξ*;² and the following afternoon of this day, when the Israelites came up from Egypt, *πέντη καὶ δεκάτῃ κατὰ σελήνην*.³

The fourteenth of Nisan between the evenings, consequently, is that point of time, when the thirteenth day closed with the going down of the sun, and the fourteenth day began; and this day continued again to the same point, the beginning of the fifteenth, and was appointed by law as the day for celebrating the paschal meal.

What is *παρασκευή*? In general, *preparation*; and hence it is used in the New Testament and by Josephus to denote the day or the hours of preparation for the sabbath; and as the first day of the festival was accounted holy like the sabbath, probably this name *παρασκευή* was also used of the day before the festival (*ἡ ἑορτή*), and signifies consequently *προεόρτιον*, *eve*, *vesper*, *la veille*. As denoting the eve of the Sabbath, [i. e. the hours just preceding,] *παρασκευή* occurs Mark 15: 42, with the explanation *ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον*; Luke 23: 54 *παρασκευή, καὶ σαββατον ἐπέφωσκε*, i. e. the sabbath was approaching; John 19: 31, 42. This *παρασκευή τοῦ σαββάτου* began, according to Josephus,⁴ at the ninth hour, i. e. about 3 o'clock, in the afternoon before the commencement of the sabbath. As signifying the day of preparation for the festival, *παρασκευή* is found only John 19: 14, *παρασκευή τοῦ πάσχα*, [i. e. of the passover in its widest sense, as including the festival of unleavened bread]. That this meaning of the word accords with the probable *usus loquendi* of the Jews, and is not merely so taken for granted out of favour to John, will be apparent, if we consider in detail the narration of the fourth gospel respecting the paschal supper of our Lord and the following events of his passion; and examine, whether it is in accordance with the laws, with the customs of

¹ Jos. Ant. 2. 14. 6. See above.² Ibid.³ Ibid. 2. 15. 2.⁴ Ibid. 16. 6. 2.

the Jews of that day, and with the accounts of the other evangelists.

The gospel of John begins the history of our Lord's passion, 13: 1, with the words, *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*. What now is the meaning of these words? According to law and custom, the proper passover was on the fourteenth day of Nisan, and on the fifteenth was the festival. Hence, *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς*, "before the festival," was the day before the festival, the day of the proper passover, on which the paschal lamb was killed and eaten in common; it was here also the eve or beginning of the paschal day, because upon the time thus specified in v. 1, followed the night in v. 30, *ἦν δὲ νύξ*; and the meal which our Lord then held with his disciples, v. 2, *δείπνου γενομένου*, was the eating of the paschal lamb. Consequently, the time here meant is the first hours of the fourteenth day of Nisan, twice twelve hours before the *festival* of the passover, the fifteenth day of Nisan.—In John 18: 28, it is related, the Jews would not go into the praetorium, "lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover, ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα." What do these words mean? According to the repeated testimony of Josephus, and the express declaration in Luke 22: 1, *πάσχα* is also the festival of unleavened bread, *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἄζυμων*; as likewise we find *ἐν τῷ πάσχα* in John 18: 39, parallel to *κατὰ ἑορτήν* in Matt. 27: 15. Mark 15: 6. Luke 23: 17. On this festival, according to the law, Lev. 23: 6, *τὰ ἄζυμα*, unleavened bread, was to be eaten; and from Josh. 5: 10, we learn that on the second passover-day, *τὰ ἄζυμα*, unleavened bread, actually was eaten; consequently the phrase *ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα* is here synonymous with *ἵνα φάγωσι τὰ ἄζυμα*, and is therefore to be understood of the beginning of the proper festival, on the fifteenth day of Nisan, when by law and custom this particular kind of meal was to be held. In what it consisted, it does not here concern us to know; enough, it was a meal established by law and custom. And Deut. 16: 1, 2, as well as the usage of the rabbins, shews incontestibly, that *πᾶσχα*, even when killing and eating are mentioned, does not always mean exclusively the paschal lamb, but includes also other sacrifices.

John 19: 14, *ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*. Are we here to understand a preparation for the proper paschal meal, as the author of the *Probabilia* assumes? or do these words refer to the paschal *festival*? So far as the *usus loquendi* of the Jews

of that age is known to us, *παρασκευή* is used in reference to only one holy day, the sabbath;—we know of no *παρασκευή* for the proper paschal meal; neither Josephus, where he speaks of the killing of the lambs,¹ or elsewhere, nor the evangelists, where they relate the discourse of our Lord with his disciples respecting the passover, their questions, our Lord's commission, and the arrangements of the disciples, mention any *παρασκευή*,—they employ neither the noun nor the verb, but merely say, *ἐτοιμάσωμεν, ἐτοιμάσατε, ἡτοίμασαν*, Matt. 26: 17, 19. Mark 14: 15, 16. Luke 22: 12, 13. On the other hand, *πάσχα*, where the paschal lamb is not the special subject of discourse, means in Josephus and in the evangelists the *festival*, *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων*, and is so used by John in c. 18: 39, where he speaks of the custom of setting free a prisoner *ἐν τῷ πάσχα*, for which the other evangelists, in the parallel passages, employ *κατὰ τὴν ἑορτήν*, Matt. 27: 15. Mark 15: 6. Luke 23: 17. But to this festival was ascribed a character of sanctity, as to the sabbath, Ex. 12: 16. Lev. 23: 17; the latter had its *παρασκευή*, and in like manner before the festival, upon the fourteenth day of Nisan, all leaven was to be put away, and consequently a preparation, a *παρασκευή*, made against the festival; Ex. 12: 15—20. Hence *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* is here the preparation for the festival, and not for the proper paschal meal; which moreover was prepared towards evening, and not in the forenoon, and John makes the remark in order to note the exact time of Jesus' condemnation; for which reason also he specifies the hour of the day, viz. the sixth hour, or noon.

John 19: 31. That the Jews, since it was the preparation, *ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν*, did not wish the bodies to remain upon the cross on the sabbath, can here be said only of the *παρασκευὴ τοῦ σαββάτου*, which all the evangelists concur in representing as the time when Jesus was taken down from the cross; Mark 15: 42, *παρασκευὴ, ὃ ἐστὶ προσάββατον*. Luke 23: 54, *παρασκευὴ, καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε*. Now because this sabbath coincided with the first day of the proper festival, which also in itself was to be sanctified like the sabbath. John expressly subjoins *ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου*, “for that day of the sabbath was a great day.” But only the first proper festival day can be here meant; for only this and the last or seventh day were *μεγάλοι*, because these are called holy in the law; and not every day of the festival, as Guericke

¹ Jos. B. J. 6. 9. 3.

supposes,¹ from a misapprehension of the passage in the Sept. Is. 1: 13. The *ἡμέρα μεγάλη* (Engl. 'calling of assemblies') is there put on an equality with the holy day, the sabbath, *σάββατα*, and is therefore to be understood of a festival; as is shown also by the other passage quoted by him, John 7: 37, where it is expressly said, that *ἡ ἡμέρα μεγάλη* was the last day, *ἑσχάτη*. These two words, *ἡ μεγάλη*, serve here as a very exact designation of the time. The festival, *ἡ ἑορτή*, was impending, and fell upon the sabbath,—not the second day of the festival, and still less the day of the paschal lamb; for neither of these was *μεγάλη*, but only the first and seventh days of the festival. Nor did the *παράσκευή τοῦ σάββατου* continue a whole day, as Griesike asserts; but began, according to Josephus,² at the ninth hour of the day before the sabbath, i. e. three hours before the commencement of the sabbath; and, consequently, precisely at the time when Luke describes our Lord as having expired, c. 23: 44, "And there was darkness until the ninth hour;" comp. v. 46. This therefore is also particularly noted by John.

According to the accounts, then, of the evangelist John, Jesus partook with his disciples of the paschal lamb, as the law ordained and the Jews were wont, on the day before the festival of unleavened bread, in the first hours of the fourteenth day of Nisan; in the night following this meal he was arrested; on the morning following this night, and consequently (since the *festival* of the passover began on the *eve* of the fifteenth) on the day of preparation for the *festival*, *παράσκευή τοῦ πάσχα*, he was condemned and crucified; and on the afternoon of the same day, in the *παράσκευή* of the sabbath, upon which the first festival fell, and consequently after the ninth hour of the day, he was taken down from the cross and laid in the tomb. All this followed in the interval of one day, the fourteenth of Nisan, from its commencement at sunset till towards its closing hours before the sunset which ushered in the fifteenth; in our way of reckoning, from the evening of Thursday till towards the evening of Friday.

How now do the other evangelists accord with the accounts of John? Luke relates, 22: 1, "The festival of unleavened bread drew near, which is called the passover, *ἤγγισε δὲ ἡ ἑορτή*. In v. 7, "Then came the day of unleavened bread, [i. e. in the widest

¹ In Winer's *Nenes Krit. Journ.* B. 3. St. 3.

² *Jos. Ant.* 16. 6. 2.

sense,] when the passover must be killed, ἦλθε δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἁγίων ἐν ἧ κ. τ. λ." i. e. the day *was coming*, on which it must be killed, viz. the fourteenth of Nisan, ἦλθε Aorist,—it had not yet actually come, but was near; and now Jesus directs his disciples to prepare the paschal lamb, v. 9—13. They go and do according to his directions; and when now the hour was come, v. 14, ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, i. e. the hour of the coming day, on which, according to v. 7, the passover was to be killed [and eaten], and after it had actually been killed and prepared by the disciples, v. 9 sq. Jesus placed himself (reclined) with his twelve disciples at the table. But since that ἦλθε v. 7, and this ἐγένετο v. 14, we cannot well suppose a whole night and a whole day (νυκθήμερον) to have passed, quite to the end of the day to which ἦλθε refers in v. 7; it must therefore be the beginning and not the end of that day which is here meant, viz. of the fourteenth of Nisan, on which by law and custom the paschal lamb was to be killed and eaten. Is not this the same description which Josephus gives, in different places, of this custom and of this appointed time? that on the thirteenth of Nisan, the paschal lambs should be made ready against the fourteenth;¹ that the lambs were killed in the interval from the 9th to the 11th hour, or, in our mode of reckoning, from 3 to 5 o'clock;² and, ἐνταύθης δὲ τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης, as the fourteenth day was ushered in, the paschal meal was eaten?³—In Luke 23: 44, there was darkness until the ninth hour; v. 46, Jesus expires; v. 54, he is laid in the tomb; it was the παρασκευή, the sabbath drew on.

According to Luke's narrative, then, Jesus ate the paschal lamb with his disciples, in the first hours of the fourteenth of Nisan; was arrested in the night after this supper; on the following day was crucified, expired, was buried during the παρασκευή, at the approach of the sabbath; and since at all times the festival followed the fourteenth, and commenced on the fifteenth, so according to Luke also the sabbath and the first day of the proper festival fell together. All took place from the beginning of the fourteenth of Nisan till towards the close of the same day, i. e. from the evening of Thursday till towards the evening of Friday.

¹ Jos. Ant. 2. 14. 6.² Jos. B. J. 6. 9. 3.³ Jos. Ant. 2. 14. 6.

Matthew and Mark exhibit likewise their usual coincidence in their accounts of our Lord's last passover; except that the latter adds a few clauses in order to specify the time more definitely. The date of the paschal supper, as given by Matthew and Mark, has apparently the most difficulty, and seems least of all to accord with the reckoning of John. It has therefore been the occasion of all the idle hypotheses and false theories which we find in the commentaries on the gospels; and yet, after all, it harmonizes entirely with the accounts of John, of Luke, and with Josephus. We must, however, not forget, that the gospels are wholly popular writings, composed by men without scientific culture, who spoke and wrote in the language of common life, and are to be understood accordingly.

The note of time in Matt. 26: 2, "Ye know that after two days is the passover," is of little importance. As *πάσχα*, without farther limitation, very commonly signifies the festival,¹ which began with the fifteenth, Jesus may have spoken these words in the beginning of the thirteenth of Nisan, as Paulus also supposes;² and according to the more definite notice of Mark 14: 1, *ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο κ. τ. λ.* "after two days was the passover and the festival," etc. the words were actually spoken somewhere about the close of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth of Nisan; for Jesus was then at an entertainment in the house of Simon, consequently towards evening.³

Matt. 26: 17, *τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων*, might in itself mean 'on the first festival day,' the fifteenth of Nisan; for strictly speaking that was *ἡ πρώτη τῶν ἁζύμων*. But Josephus reckons sometimes *seven* days of *τὰ ἄζυμα*, when he speaks strictly according to the law; and sometimes *eight* days,⁴ in the language of common life, where the fourteenth of Nisan also may be reckoned among the *ἄζυμα*, as in Luke 22: 7. The reason of this probably was, because on that day, according to Ex. 12: 15 and the Mishna,⁵ every thing leavened was to be put away; and

¹ Luke 22: 1.

² Comm. III. p. 96.

³ This remark would seem to imply a *lapsus animæ* on the part of the author; for the account of the meal in Simon's house stands in no necessary connexion with the above note of time; and is moreover said by John, 12: 1, to have taken place *six* days before the passover.—ED.

⁴ Jos. Ant. 2. 15. 1.

⁵ Tract. Pesachim, c. 1.

thus there came out just eight days, when leavened bread was again introduced on the twenty-first. Consequently, the fourteenth of Nisan is to be understood here, as in Luke. The writer might however mean the beginning, the middle, or the end of that day. But Mark 14: 12, specifies the time more definitely: ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον, "when they killed the paschal lamb;" and after Jesus had now directed the disciples, in Matt. 26: 18 and Mark 14: 13, to prepare the passover, and they had done this, it is said in Matt. 26: 20 and Mark 14: 17, ὥσπας γενομένης ἀνέκειτο, "evening being come he reclined," etc. The representation then is, that on the first day of unleavened bread, when the paschal lamb was killed, after Jesus had directed his disciples to prepare the paschal meal, and when the evening was now actually come, he placed himself (reclined) at table with the twelve. In what part of the fourteenth day of Nisan was this? According to a custom already noticed,¹ resting probably on pharisaical grounds, or introduced perhaps merely by way of caution, in order to have the killing of the lambs completed in all cases by the time fixed in the law, the lambs were killed not between the evenings, as was appointed by law, i. e. in the very beginning of the fourteenth day, but they were killed from the ninth to the eleventh hour of the thirteenth of Nisan, towards evening. Hence the latter part of the thirteenth of Nisan, from the ninth hour on, was in common parlance included under the name of the fourteenth, as one of the ἄζυμα; because in these last hours of the thirteenth, *that* had already been done which properly belonged to the first hours of the fourteenth; and the phrases τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων and ὥσπας γενομένης consequently apply also to the interval from the ninth hour of the thirteenth to the beginning of the fourteenth of Nisan. Indeed, when on the afternoon of the thirteenth of Nisan the 100,000 lambs were driven to the temple, and the vast multitude of Jews collected from every quarter at Jerusalem were all in motion, in order to purchase a lamb and bring it to the slaughter and procure the other necessities appertaining to the meal, if a stranger, astonished at the uproar, had inquired after the cause of it, would not every Jew have replied: "It is the passover, ἡ πρώτη τῶν ἁζύμων;" although we, with our book-knowledge, understand this name only of a time three hours later? Is it not customary

¹ See p. 114 above.

even among ourselves to speak of Christmas, or Easter, as being actually come, some hours or even a day before these festivals are publicly celebrated? The Jews began their day strictly at sunset; but the preceding natural day continues beyond sunset, beyond this arbitrary commencement of the new day, until it is fully night; and in like manner, when there began at sunset a new day, more important and distinguished than the preceding, this following day, as the *pars potior*, threw back its name and dignity upon the last hours of the preceding one. A remarkable instance of this occurs in the description which the Mishna gives, of the libation of the priests during the feast of tabernacles: "Every day of the festival, on the *sabbath* as well as on other days, the priests draw water from Siloah and pour it on the altar; but the water which is to be poured out on the *sabbath*, is brought *on the eve* of that day (*a vespera sabbati*) from Siloah, and is mean time set away covered in a vault of the temple." So in the Mishna, where the rabbins give their opinions respecting the labours to be permitted or forbidden on the *sabbath*, Mar Okelu says: "When one has prepared ointment on the eve of the *sabbath* (*vespere sabbati*), and applies it on the *sabbath*, he commits no sin." There was therefore an *eve* of the *sabbath* before its commencement; and therefore probably an *eve* of the *passover* likewise before its beginning.¹ And in general, the latter part of the current day, perhaps from the ninth hour on, seems to have been regarded as the approach, beginning, *diluculum*, of the following; hence ἐπέφωσκε, Luke 23: 54.

Mark 15: 42. In speaking of the arrangements for burying the body of Jesus, the writer adds: ἡν παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶ προσαββατον, i. e. the *eve* or preparation of the *sabbath*; as in Luke 23: 54. John 19: 31.

Finally, in Matt. 27: 62, the day after the burial of Jesus is the *sabbath*, μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν; and consequently, the time when our Lord held his last paschal meal with the disciples, was on Thursday evening of our reckoning.

According to the accounts then of Matthew and Mark, and of course, as we have now seen, according to all the evangelists, Jesus held the paschal meal with his disciples, conformably to the prescriptions of the law and the custom of all the Jews, in the beginning of the fourteenth of Nisan; in the night succeed-

¹ Comp. Paulus Comm. IV. p. 385, 474.

ing this meal he was arrested ; on the morning following was condemned and crucified ; he expired and was buried on the eve or preparation of the sabbath, towards the end of the fourteenth of Nisan ; and all this took place, according to our mode of reckoning, in the interval from the evening of Thursday till towards the evening of Friday. John relates the circumstances like all the other evangelists ; except that here, as in the other parts of his gospel generally, he specifies the dates with more exactness, and carefully distinguishes the days even to the hours. In this we recognise the attentive observer and eye-witness. So that the existing confusion could not possibly have arisen in regard to this section of history, had the proper degree of credit been attributed to his testimony, and he himself been estimated as what he really is, the author of the chief gospel of the christian dispensation.

The explanation which we have given of the gospel history of our Lord's last passover, presents itself spontaneously, as the result of credible and incontestible accounts of Moses, of the evangelists, and of Josephus ; without any forced or artificial interpretation of single words or phrases ; without any hypotheses or arbitrary presuppositions ; and it removes all those stones of stumbling which have been thought to exist, either in the narratives of particular evangelists, or in the comparison of them with one another.

Unfounded therefore, wholly, seem now to us the hypotheses, by the aid of which the author of the *Probabilia* attempts to explain the alleged contradictions in the fourth gospel, against itself and against the other evangelists.

Empty and worthless are to us all other hypotheses which have been, in like manner, invented and dressed up with art ; e. g. as if Jesus had held only a *πάσχα μνημονικόν*, or had celebrated the *θύσιμον* with one party of the Jews a day earlier than the greater portion of the people. Such hypotheses are in part unsusceptible of proof and drawn merely from the air ; in part they have the express testimony of the evangelists against them ; and in part they by no means afford that aid which their inventors promised from them ; as Gabler and Paulus have fully shewn. It is not necessary even to apply any strange or unusual modes of interpretation or ellipses, such as so many interpreters have supposed to be requisite ; e. g. John 13: 1 *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς*, as if for *ἐν τῷ προεορτίῳ*,—or John 19: 14, *παρασκευῇ τοῦ πάσχα*, as if put for *ἡμέρα τοῦ πάσχα, ἣτις ἦν παρασκευῇ*

τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τοῦ σαββάτου τοῦ πάσχα, or for παρασκευὴ , μεγάλη τοῦ σαββάτου, or for παρασκευὴ ἐν τῷ πάσχα, etc.

It will now be no longer necessary to inquire with prolixity, how Jesus, on the chief festival day of the passover, a day demanding the repose of the sabbath,¹ could have been taken prisoner, and, amid so wild a tumult of the people and their leaders, been tried, condemned, and crucified; for on this chief day of the festival Jesus rested already in his tomb. Nor, in order to support a preconceived opinion, will it do to allege, that judicial inquiries and executions were permitted on festival days and on the sabbath; for in Matt. 26: 5, the Sanhedrim themselves use the precaution: "Not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar among the people;" and it was here not the multitude of the people that they thus professed to care for, since these were already convened and were not still to arrive, but the sacredness of the sabbath united with the festival. Just as little can an appeal be made to Acts 12: 3, as affirming that Herod made havoc among the disciples of Jesus during Easter; for there only the *ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων* are mentioned, without any mention of the festival, or first day, to which and the seventh alone a sacredness like that of the sabbath was attributed; and further, Peter was only arrested, and was to have been executed only after the festival. The same holds good also of the passage cited by Paulus² from the Mishna, in support of the same opinion, viz. that "criminals condemned for blasphemy should be brought from the provinces to Jerusalem, and there executed during the festival;" for what might be done on other days of the festival,³ was not necessarily permitted on the first and seventh days.

With our explanation fully accords also the ancient tradition, which still survives in the customs of the christian church, viz. that the festival of pentecost, which always fell upon the same day of the week as the second day of the passover-festival, occurred for the first time in the christian church on Sunday. For if, according to our view, the fifteenth of Nisan, which began Friday evening and continued till Saturday evening, was at the same time the Jewish Sabbath and the paschal festival, *ἐορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων*, then the second day of the festival, beginning with Saturday evening, was Sunday; and consequently the first day of pentecost fell also on Sunday. There is

¹ Ex. 12: 16. Lev. 23: 7. Numb. 28: 18.

² Comm. III. p. 543.

³ Lev. 23: 15.

therefore no ground to cast suspicion on this very ancient tradition, in order to get rid of the discrepancy arising out of the common view of the question ; nor to adopt the unfounded conjecture, that the sabbath or the second paschal day probably occasioned a change ; nor, finally, to suppose with Guerike,¹ that the apostles actually received the Holy Ghost on the first day of pentecost, but did not perceive the effects of it until the second day.—Nor does it present any ground of difficulty, when Jesus after the paschal meal says to Judas, John 13:29, “What thou doest, do quickly,” and that this was understood by some of the disciples as a direction to purchase what was necessary for the festival ; as if this could not have suggested itself to their minds, because, if the festival occurred on the second day after, there was time the whole of the next day to make purchases ; and as if therefore this was merely a casual suggestion of one or another disciple, such as the wisest sometimes yield to momentarily, which he immediately observed and endeavoured to mend : “Or that he should give something to the poor.” Nevertheless, in such a vast multitude of persons as were usually assembled in and around Jerusalem at the passover, an early provision for the necessities of the festival might not have been so unnecessary ; nor this suggestion of the disciples been drawn so entirely from the air.

And finally, when, as Irenaeus the disciple of Polycarp relates,² in the first Easter controversy between the oriental and occidental churches, in the second century, Polycarp appealed to the fact that Jesus partook of the paschal lamb for the last time along with the Jews ; and affirms that he himself had received this account, as well as the custom of celebrating the passover yearly along with the Jews, from the apostle John ; (although the point in controversy was a different one, and properly regarded only the mode of celebration in the church at that time ;) he did not assuredly make his appeal to the oral instruction alone received from the apostle John, but naturally also to his gospel. Indeed this gospel testifies to that fact more clearly and expressly, than the other evangelists ; and instead of Polycarp's declaration being, as the author of the *Probabilia* supposes, directly in contradiction with the fourth gospel, (*e diametro*

¹ In Winer's Neues krit. Journ. B. 3. St. 3.

² See Euseb. Hist. Ecc. V. 24.

contradixisset.) it is on the contrary perfectly in accord with it, and furnishes a remarkable testimony to its truth.

Other minor circumstances speak also in favour of our explanation, upon which it is not necessary here to dwell; e. g. the opinion of the Greek church, that the sacrament of the Lord's supper was first instituted with common leavened bread; because Jesus ate the passover on the evening following the thirteenth of Nisan, i. e. at the beginning of the fourteenth. With this harmonizes also the statute in Ex. 12: 15, that on the first paschal day every thing leavened should be put away; as also the account of Maimonides, that among the ancient Jews it was not forbidden to eat leavened bread up to the middle of the fourteenth of Nisan; probably in correspondence with its being again prepared on the twenty-first. So in 1 Cor. 5: 7, the apostle reminds Christians, that Christ, as a paschal lamb, is already sacrificed for them; and therefore he now urges them to put away all leaven, and keep the festival of the passover with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

From the explanation which we have now carried through, we see incontrovertibly, that it has been alone the misapprehension of interpreters, that has occasioned all the alleged obscurity and discrepancy of the evangelists in this part of their history. Just as clearly also does it now appear, that the author of the *Probabilia*, by the aid of similar misapprehension and by an art peculiar to himself, has himself produced those contradictions which he professes to have found in the fourth gospel.

ART. V. OUTLINES OF A COURSE OF THEOLOGICAL STUDY FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS.

Prepared by the Theological Faculty in the University of Leipzig. Translated from the German by the Editor.*

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The successful prosecution of any study depends upon a proper choice of the objects of study, and upon a good beginning. Ignorance of the true object in view and the extent of it, as also the want of a regular plan in respect to diligence both in public and private study, have often been the source of irretrievable injury even to the most gifted mind.

§ 2. It is therefore the purpose of the Theological Faculty, in the following pages, to present to the young theologian as complete a view as possible of the whole circle of theological science, and also brief instructions for pursuing the study of it in this university.

§ 3. The essential features of this outline of theological *Propædæutics*,¹ (called also *Hodegetics*, *Isagoge*, *Introduction*, etc.)

* The following article, it will be perceived, is similar in its character to one published in a former number of this work, Vol. I. p. 613 sq. which was drawn up by the Theological Faculty of the University of Halle. The present one, however, exhibits a more condensed view of the subject, and also imparts more definite advice in respect to the mode of pursuing theological studies. It was therefore thought expedient to insert it, as a correct and interesting outline of the state and character of theological science in Germany. It was transmitted to the Editor by Prof. Habu, and is not improbably from his pen.—ED.

¹ *Propædæutics*, *Hodegetics*, *Isagoge*, equivalent to the Greek words προπαιδεία, ὁδηγία, εἰσαγωγή, (or rather to adjective forms, προπαιδευτικός, ὁδηγητικός,) all mean *preparatory instruction*, i. e. directions for entering upon the study of any science. *Theological Encyclopædia* is the circle of theological sciences, or a mere theoretical survey and enumeration of them. *Methodology* consists of practical directions as to the best method of study, etc. as above explained in the text.—Compare the article in Vol. I. p. 201, of this work.—ED.

will therefore consist: I. In a sketch of the different parts of theological science in their organic connexion and relations to each other, i. e. the outlines of a *Theological Encyclopaedia*. II. In showing how the study of theology must in general be arranged and pursued, viz. in what order and succession the lectures upon theological subjects may most appropriately be heard; in what connexion with each other and with preparatory and auxiliary studies and sciences they may best be taken up; and how they may be best aided and sustained by private diligence and various exercises. This is *Theological Methodology*.

§ 4. In order to hope for success in the study of theology, the student must not only feel a decided internal call to this profession, but must also possess a previous general education and liberal cultivation of mind, or a certain amount of thorough preparatory knowledge; most of which is usually acquired in the higher schools. As necessary portions of this we may here specify more particularly, an acquaintance with *Philology*, (the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages,) with *History*, and with the *Mathematics*.

§ 5. But as the preparatory studies cannot well be carried far enough at the high schools, they must therefore be continued at the university; and the first year especially should be chiefly, if not exclusively, devoted to them. To these however should be superadded the perusal of other branches; without an acquaintance with which the loftier heights of science can never be approached. These are distinguished from the strictly theological studies, and included under the name of *auxiliary sciences*; by means of which the preparatory education of the student is carried out to a wider extent and its foundations more deeply laid. In the university language these are called the *philosophical sciences*; because they are mostly taught in the lectures of those professors who belong to the so-called Faculty of Philosophy.¹

§ 6. These studies, particularly *Logic* and *Mathematics*, stand in the most intimate connexion with all true science, and especially with the thorough scientific study of Christian Theology and its different branches; and they constitute with the latter several parallels, which correspond throughout, viz.

1. *Philology* corresponds to *exegetical* theology,—both the Greek-occidental or classical, and oriental philology in general.

¹ See Vol. I. p. 7, of this work.

This is true also of both the constituent parts of these sciences, the *grammatico-lexical*, and the *archaeological*. The results of grammatico-lexical study not only serve to prepare the way and afford a basis for judging of the character of the biblical language and idioms; but they are often the only sources of exegetical certainty and thoroughness. But an acquaintance with the subjects, which are usually comprehended under the term *Archaeology*, such as geography, chronology, religion (with mythology), politics, the civil and domestic manners and customs of ancient nations, is also not less important to the biblical interpreter, on account of the very numerous allusions to them in the Holy Scriptures.

2) The *Philosophy of Religion*,—both metaphysics and ethics,—corresponds to systematic theology, i. e. dogmatic and moral theology.

3) The general *History of the World*, and also in particular the history of different religions and modes of worship, and of the various philosophical systems, stands in very close relation with the history of the christian religion and church, and of the manifold forms of christian doctrine.

4) *Rhetoric*, *Paedagogics*, and *Psychological Anthropology*, are auxiliary studies, which yield important aid in the department of practical theology.

I. OUTLINES OF THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPAEDIA.

§7. Christian Theology, regarded as a science, comprises two grand divisions, viz. *Theoretical* and *Practical* theology. The *former* regards Christianity in and by itself, as a higher and nobler phenomenon in the life of man, and aims to unfold it in its origin, in its essential nature, and in its various modifications and historical character. The *latter* instructs the future teacher of religion how to proceed in communicating to others, in the best possible manner, the knowledge and conviction which he himself has acquired, and also that higher spiritual life which these are adapted to awaken.

1. *Theoretical Theology.*

§8. This comprises again a threefold subdivision, according as its object in regard to divine truth and evangelical doctrine,

is: (1) To derive them, in their original purity and fulness, immediately from the authentic records, by means of correct interpretation; (2) To arrange and unite them, according to their different parts, and in conformity with their fundamental principle, into one complete whole; (3) To describe their effects, and narrate their history, in the world. Hence the division into *Exegetical*, *Systematic*, and *Historical* theology; each of which, again, has its own special subdivisions.

Exegetical Theology.

§ 9. The exegetical theologian has for his object: (1) To examine the condition of the records which have been handed down to us; to ascertain those which are genuine; and to exhibit them in a text as pure and complete as possible. (2) To acquire a knowledge of languages, antiquities, etc. (§ 6,) which shall render the proper understanding of the Holy Scriptures accessible to him. (3) To become acquainted with the laws and conditions necessary for the correct application of all the means of interpretation. (4) Actually to apply all these in every respect with conscientiousness and skill.—Exegetical theology, therefore, may be subdivided into four branches, viz. *Biblical Criticism*, which is either taught separately, or, very frequently, in connexion with an historical Introduction to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; *Biblical Philology*, including the knowledge both of languages and of antiquities, etc. *Theoretical* and *Practical Exegesis*, i. e. *Biblical Hermeneutics* and *Exegesis*. The latter, or practical exegesis, as being the actual interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, is the grand object, to which all the other branches stand in the relation of *means*; and this is better learned from oral instruction and living example, *viva vox magistris*, than from any rules.

NOTE. *Hermeneutics* is also sometimes taught separately; sometimes along with an Introduction to the Scriptures; and sometimes in connexion with exegesis itself.

Systematic Theology.

§ 10. This is the systematic arrangement and exhibition of the doctrines contained in the holy records, as ascertained by means of exegesis. Since now these doctrines appertain partly to christian *faith*, and partly to christian *life*, the whole is subdivided into *dogmatics*, or the doctrines relating to faith, and *ethics* or *morals*, i. e. the doctrines relating to practice.

§ 11. *Dogmatics*, or dogmatical theology, is the science which unites and exhibits the biblical doctrines respecting faith into one complete and systematic whole, and traces them back to the ultimate grounds on which they rest. But as the doctrines of christian faith have, from the very first, partly stood in opposition to other forms of religion, and partly been exhibited under different modifications by various parties and teachers in the church, it is not unusual to make a distinction between *biblical dogmatics*, (more commonly called *biblical theology*,) and *ecclesiastical*. These branches are not only often taught separately; but there are also several subordinate branches, connected with this biblical-ecclesiastical theology as their main science, viz. *Apologetics*, *Symbolics*, *Polemics*, and *Irenics*.

§ 12. It is the province of *Apologetics* to defend Christianity as a divine revelation against all opposers.

The province of *Symbolics* lies partly in presenting a knowledge of the symbolical writings, i. e. the public *creeds* or confessions of faith of the churches; and partly in an exhibition of the peculiar doctrines contained in them, by which one church is distinguished from another.

Polemics is the scientific arrangement and exhibition of the proofs of those particular doctrines, as to the reception of which different confessions disagree.

Irenics has for its object the end of all strife. Consequently its first aim is *tolerance*; and then, after the avoidance of hindrances by the removal of error and doubt, its ultimate aim is the union of all christian sects and parties. As such, it is also called *Henotics*.

§ 13. Christian *Ethics*, or *Moral Theology*, is the science which treats of the essential nature and conditions of christian virtue. It has the subordinate branches of *Ascetics* and *Casistry*. The former of these is the scientific exhibition of all the motives, means, and exercises, (*αἰσθησις*), by which the heart and will of the Christian may be guided, purified, and confirmed in virtue. The latter sets forth the principles, according to which, in particular cases of conscience (*casus conscientiae*), where two or more duties seem to come in collision, the question must, in conformity with christian morals, be decided.

Historical Theology.

§ 14. This has for its province to describe, both in general and in particular, the changes which the religion of the Bible and

the ecclesiastical institutions connected with and dependent on it, have experienced; and also those which have been either caused, or in any way occasioned, by the influence of this religion and these institutions. In accordance with the different divine dispensations, this science falls into two principal divisions, viz. *History of the Old and of the New Covenant.*

§ 15. The history of the *Old Testament Religion and Theocracy*, should consist of a philosophical (pragmatisch) exhibition of the historical accounts respecting the origin and development of the Jewish Monotheism, and of the theocratic state established by ancient revelation before the time of Christ; not only in respect to its original constitution and object, but also in its deformed and degenerate condition in the periods immediately before and after the coming of Christ. It will likewise be understood as a matter of course, that an accurate acquaintance with the *Jewish doctrines, sects, and manners and customs*, is an essential prerequisite for the correct interpretation, not only of the books of the Old Testament, but also for those of the New.

§ 16. The second division of Historical Theology commonly appears under the name of the *History of the Christian Church*. It includes, however, as much the history of ecclesiastical opinions, as it does the external character and constitution of the church; and is therefore properly termed the *History of the Christian Religion and Church*.

§ 17. But the uncommon extent and high importance of this branch of theological science, has been the occasion of separating some of the subjects belonging to it, and treating of them in particular works and courses of lectures. Thus the exhibition of the original formation, of the development, and of the various modifications and changes in the system of religious faith, constitutes the *History of Christian Doctrine* (Domengeschichte). The description of the external institutions of the church, in their relations to time and space, their favourable and unfavourable changes, both in general and in particular countries and communions, is usually given under the name of *Ecclesiastical Statistics, Constitutions*, or also *Archaeology*.

§ 18. But even in these wide fields, a minute and thorough acquaintance with the subjects, requires that some particular portions should be handled separately. Thus we have the *History of the Apostolic Age; Patristics*, or an account of the lives, writings, and doctrines of the earlier christian teachers, particularly those of the first five or six centuries; the *History of the*

Martyrs; that of *Heretics*; of the *Middle Ages*; of *Scholasticism*; of *Mysticism*; of the *Hierarchy* in general, and of the *Roman Hierarchy* (the Popes) in particular; the *History of Councils*; of the *Ecclesiastical Orders*, especially of *Monasticism*; *History of the Reformation*; of *Missions*; of *Theological Science and Literature*, etc.

2. Practical Theology.

§ 19. This embraces, in accordance with its great aim, (§ 7), all the branches of theological science which relate to *Preaching*. The object of them all is, to point out the multiplied ways and forms, in which the truths of the Christian religion may be most certainly and effectually brought home to, and appropriated by, the hearts of men, according to their various capacities and temperaments respectively. This department is therefore often called *Pastoral Theology*; although according to the prevailing terminology, this last is still treated as a particular branch of practical theology.

§ 20. But as a clergyman is placed in various relations, so he must act in different ways for the improvement and edification of the members of the visible church, and the advancement of Christ's kingdom on earth. He must be the living herald and interpreter of God's word before the people; the teacher of those who need instruction, especially of the young; the manager and steward of the public services of religion, and of particular sacred ordinances; and finally the director, the representative, and the pastor, of particular churches. Hence the whole department of practical theology is comprised in the four following branches of study, preparatory to the proper exercise of the pastoral office: *Homiletics*, *Catechetics*, *Liturgics*, and *Pastoral Theology*.

§ 21. *Homiletics*, or the theory of christian eloquence, teaches the proper method in which connected public discourses on the truths of religion, are to be composed and delivered.

§ 22. *Catechetics* points out the best mode of imparting instruction in religious truth to children and those who are spiritually unlearned, in the catechetical (erotematic) form, according to their individual necessities and capacities.

§ 23. *Liturgics* treats of the public services of religion; it teaches the appropriate arrangement of public worship; and designates particularly the forms which the clergyman is to follow in the performance of his official duties.

§ 24. *Pastoral Theology* (Instruction in Pastoral Wisdom, i. e. Pastoral Science) points out in what manner the clergyman, as a pastor having the care of souls, should order his conduct in all his relations to the people under his charge; and also, as a servant of the church and state, towards those who are set over him. Hence, also, the science of Pastoral Theology includes at least some degree of attention to the *Ecclesiastical* or *Canon Law*; or, if not to this general subject, (which is usually taught by the Professors of Law,) yet to that particular branch of it which is recognized as valid in the church, country, or province, where the individual is to spend his days.

II. OUTLINES OF THEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY.

§ 25. If it be the province of Theological Encyclopaedia to introduce the young theologian to an acquaintance with the circle of sciences on which he is about to enter; it is in like manner the province of *Methodology*, as a branch of Hodegetics, to lead him to personal diligence and activity in these studies, and teach him how to shape his course and direct his efforts, so as to make the best possible use of the short period of academic life, and derive from it the greatest and most enduring profit.

§ 26. With this view we here subjoin a plan, specifying the order and succession in which the different branches of theological science, and consequently, in an academic life, the courses of lectures, may most appropriately be heard and studied.

NOTE. It is of course impossible to give a plan, which shall correspond to the wants and circumstances of every individual student. Many therefore will doubtless feel themselves compelled to deviate from our plan in some particulars. The following may be some of the causes:

1) The order and character of the lectures themselves; or the hours at which they are delivered,—at the same hour perhaps with other lectures which one must hear.

2) The respect and confidence which the student may have for this or that instructor, may induce an earlier or later or repeated attendance on his lectures.

3) In proportion to their previous preparation or intellectual capacity, some will be more and some less qualified to attend this or that course of lectures.

4) The following plan is arranged upon the supposition, that the

whole course of study is to occupy only three years. But if a student can devote a longer time to the academic course, (which certainly is very much to be desired,) he will be able readily to make the proper modifications in our plan; and what is here suggested, will not, even in that case, cease to be useful to him.

General Outline of the Plan.

§ 27. The first of the three academic years is to be devoted chiefly to those branches of theological science which are *preparatory*; the second year to the *historical and systematic* branches; and the third year to the *practical* branches. But the *exegetical* studies must throughout accompany the others; and for this reason it is advisable to attend, during the two first years at least, exegetical lectures on the most important and most difficult books of the Holy Scriptures.

First Year.

§ 28. The chief study in this year should be the *Philosophical Sciences*, (see § 5,) viz. *Philosophy* together with the other auxiliary branches, as *Philology* both classic and biblical, and *History*. These studies should indeed be still further pursued as the companions of those which are more strictly theological; while the latter ought in this year not only to be attended to in the way of preparation, but actually commenced.

The following courses of lectures are to be attended :

FIRST SEMESTER.

Logic and Metaphysics.
Exposition of one or more of the Classics.
Grammar and the philosophy of Grammar.
History.
Historical and Critical Introduction to the Writings of the O. and N. Test.
Exegesis of the O. and N. Test.
Jewish Archaeology and Philosophy.
Hermeneutics.

SECOND SEMESTER.

Moral Philosophy.
Psychology and Anthropology.
History of Philosophy.
Exposition of some Classic.
Historical and Critical Introduction to the Writings of the O. and N. Testament.*
Exegesis of the O. and N. Test.
History of the Church. 1st Half.
Criticism (Kritik).

* Whenever lectures on the same subjects are assigned to different semesters, it is to be understood that they have previously either not been heard at all, or only in part.

NOTE. Even in case all the lectures above proposed should be actually delivered and attended, they would not require on an average more than *four* or at most *five* hours a day ; and there would consequently always remain time for recreation and private study.

For a course of private study, the following subjects may be recommended, especially when there are no lectures upon them ; viz. the *History of Philosophy* down to the present time ; *Biblical Archaeology and History* ; the *Hellenistic Greek* in general, and the *Dialect of the New Testament* in particular ; together with the cursory reading of the New Testament and the Historical books of the Old in the original. Besides this, *Disputatoria* upon philosophical problems, either under the guidance of an instructor or with intelligent friends, will be found very useful.

Second Year.

§ 29. The attention in this year should be chiefly directed to *Historical and Systematic Theology*.

The following lectures are to be attended :

THIRD SEMESTER.	FOURTH SEMESTER.
History of the Church, 1st or 2nd Half.	History of the Church, 2nd Half.
Systematic Theology (Dogmatik).	Systematic Theology (Dogmatik), 1st or 2nd Half.
History of Christian Doctrine, 1st Half.	History of Christian Doctrine, 1st or 2nd Half.
Biblical Theology.	Ethics.
Patristics.	Archaeology of the Church.
Exegesis of the Old and New Testament.	Exegesis of the Old and New Testament.
Exposition of some Classic.	History of different Religions.

NOTE. For the course of private study may be particularly recommended, the *repetition* of the lectures and a perusal of the text books, as also *disputatoria* on important theological topics ; the continuance of the cursory perusal of the original Scriptures, along with the attendance on exegetical lectures. More especially, however, would we also recommend to the student the *comparison* of what he hears and learns with distinguished works on ecclesiastical history, systematic theology, and apologetics. Such works, in case he does not possess them, may be perused in the public library, or also borrowed from it.

Third Year.

§ 30. The chief study of this year is *Practical Theology*; while the study of *Systematic Theology* and the other branches, so far as not completed, is to be pursued and finished.

Hence the following lectures are to be attended :

FIFTH SEMESTER.

Systematic Theology (Dogmatik),
2nd Half.
History of Christian Doctrine, 2nd
Half.
History of the Reformation.
Symbolics.
Homiletics.
Paedagogics in general, and Cate-
chetics in particular.
Exegesis.

SIXTH SEMESTER.

Pastoral Theology.
Practical Exegesis.
Practical Homiletics, and Catechet-
ical Exercises.
Private Examinations on Systematic
Theology and Church History.

NOTE. The number of hours necessary to be devoted, during this year, to the public lectures, cannot be very great ; unless (what indeed is very much to be desired) the learner continues at the same time to hear lectures on the auxiliary sciences, and also perhaps on mathematica, natural philosophy and history, etc. or on some particular branches of the great divisions of the theological sciences. It is therefore recommended to the student, to endeavour, in his private studies, to appropriate to himself what he has hitherto accumulated, and convert it into materials for his own independent course of thought. He will also do well to read attentively and studiously some of the more difficult books of Scripture ; and to prepare himself fully for the homiletic and catechetical exercises. This is the more important ; because without such preparation, these exercises cannot be attended with the full advantage proposed. To lead the pupil to independence in his conceptions and mode of treating given subjects, is one great object of the *Literary Societies* connected with the University.

Should any one have a desire and calling to pursue his studies in a more thorough manner, and especially to trace the peculiar phenomena of the biblical grammatical forms up to their remotest sources and germs ; it will be proper for him to learn also the kindred Semitic dialects, especially the Aramæan (Syriac and Chaldaic) and Arabic, and then likewise the Samaritan and Rabbinic. In such cases the study of these languages should be commenced, at the latest, in the second year ; and if perhaps he would aim at some future time himself to become a teacher, he will find it necessary to prolong very considerably his academic course.

**ART. VI. PAUL AS THE APOSTLE OF THE HEATHEN. HIS
EDUCATION AND CALL.**

From Neander's "*History of the Planting and Progress of the Christian Church under the Apostles*," Vol. I. Translated from the German by the Editor.

[The following article is selected from a work already announced as in a course of translation by the Editor. Besides its intrinsic excellence, it may serve as a specimen of that work, and of the spirited and profound views which are characteristic of Neander. In our next Number we propose to give a longer extract, on the Constitution and worship of the primitive Churches.—ED.]

The first beginning had now been made towards the independent spread of Christianity among heathen nations; the appointment of the gospel as an independent means of training up all nations for the kingdom of God, was recognized by the apostles; and therefore no opposition on their part could now arise, when it should be applied as such among the heathen. While now through a connected series of providences in the divine wisdom, the great obstacle was thus removed which had stood in the way of the conversion of heathen nations, and the first impulse was given to this conversion itself; through other remarkable arrangements of the divine wisdom, the great champion of the faith, through whom the work thus prepared was to be completed, and the foundation laid for the salvation of the heathen through all coming ages, was called to the station which he was to occupy in the progress of the kingdom of God. This was the apostle Paul; who stands forth pre-eminent in the history of the progress of Christianity, not only from the wide extent of his apostolic field of labour; but particularly from the circumstance, that through him especially the fundamental truths of the gospel were unfolded in their lively organic connexion with each other, and compacted into one firm system of doctrine; and also that through him, especially in one point of view, the essential features of the gospel in relation to the nature of man, were brought out into the fullest light. Hence the new feeling of christian life, which so often awakes in the church at large and in individuals, has ever drawn its sustenance par-

ticularly from the writings of this apostle. And although history discovers to us only a few traces out of the earlier life of Paul, before his entrance on the apostolic calling; yet she discloses enough to demonstrate to us, how he was trained by the whole course of his peculiar moral and intellectual developement, precisely for THAT, which he was to become, and which was to be accomplished through him.

Saul or Paul—the former the original Hebrew name, and the latter its Hellenistic form¹ — was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia. That he was born there, rests upon his own testimony;² and, as varying from this, the tradition mentioned by Jerome,³ that he was born in the town of *Gishala* in Galilee, can have no authority; although this tradition may so far have had a foundation in truth, that his parents perhaps, at an earlier period, were inhabitants of that place.⁴ As we do not know how long he remained under the paternal roof, we cannot determine what influence was exerted upon his culture by an education in the metropolis of Cilicia, a city which as a seat of literature was ranked by the side of Athens and Alexandria.⁵ His early acquaintance with the Greek language and with the national peculiarities of that people, was doubtless not without influence upon

¹ This latter became the prevailing form after he had devoted his life to the conversion of the heathen, Acts 13: 9.

² Acts 21: 39. 22: 3.

³ Hieron. de V. J. c. 5.

⁴ Were we entitled with Paulus, in his work: "Des Apostels Paulus Lehrbriefe an die Galater und Römerchristen," p. 323, to understand the word *ἑβραῖος* in Phil. 3: 5, and 2 Cor. 11: 22, as denoting the opposite of *ἑλληνιστής*, this would furnish some support to the above hypothesis; because it would thence follow, that Paul could boast of his descent from a Palestine family, and not merely from Hellenistic Jews. But as Paul calls himself *ἑβραῖος*, although by birth he was certainly a Hellenist, it is apparent that the word cannot be understood in this narrower sense. In the latter passage, especially, where it is put as equivalent to *an Israelite*, one of the descendants of Abraham, the word manifestly has not this narrower meaning. Comp. Bleek, Einl. in d. Brief an d. Hebräer, p. 32.

⁵ Strabo, who wrote in the time of Augustus, places Tarsus in this respect even above those two cities. Geogr. 14. 5, *τοσαύτη τοῖς ἐνθάδε ἀνθρώποις σπουδὴ πρὸς τε φιλοσοφίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἐγκύκλιον ἅπασαν παιδείαν γέγονεν, ὥσθ' ὑπερβέβληνται καὶ Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ εἰ τινα ἄλλον τόπον δυνατόν εἰπείν, ἐν ᾧ σχολαὶ καὶ διατριβαὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων γέγονασιν.*

his training as a teacher for nations of Grecian origin. Still, the few citations from the Greek poets which occur in his speech at Athens and in his epistles, do not of themselves prove, that he became acquainted with the literature of Greece by early education. It is quite possible, though in connexion with the pharisaical zealotry of Paul not probable, that in consequence of the freer views of his more liberal-minded teacher, Gamaliel, in respect to Greek literature, he was led to occupy himself with this while at Jerusalem. It might assuredly be expected from a man of his ready and versatile mind,—from a man of an ardour like his, which triumphed over all difficulties connected with his calling; of a love like his, which translated him into the very position of those among whom he had to labour, into their wants and weaknesses; that he would be induced, from his very field of labour among nations of Greek culture, to acquire some acquaintance with their writers. In his mode of presenting subjects, the Jewish element in his education manifestly shows itself predominant. His peculiar dialectics he acquired not in the Greek, but in the Jewish school.

The name Saul, which signifies *one asked for, one desired*,¹ may perhaps refer to his having been bestowed upon his parents as a long desired firstborn son, the child of prayers;² from this, the further inference might be drawn, that he was immediately set apart by his father, a Pharisee, for the service of religion; and with that view was sent in early youth to Jerusalem, there to be trained in a school of the Pharisees as a learned interpreter of scripture and tradition. Indeed it was customary in Tarsus, in order to acquire a learned education, thus to visit foreign schools,³—a fact, however, which does not strictly require to be here taken into the account. It was important for him, that in the pharisean school at Jerusalem, he appropriated to himself that systematic form of mental discipline, which was afterwards of so much service to him in unfolding the contents of the christian scheme; and that he there also, as was likewise the case with Luther, became so thoroughly acquainted with that theological system, which at a later period

¹ שָׁאֵל, Part. Pass. of שָׁאַל to ask. This inference is too uncertain to permit us to lay much stress upon it.

² As among the Christians of the first century the names Theodore, Theodoret, etc.

³ Comp. Strabo l. c.

he was to combat from its very root. A youth of the fiery and energetic character of Paul, must have embraced with his whole soul whatever he adopted; from his very temperament he must have been prone to exaggerating and repulsive zeal; and these tendencies found great sustenance in Phariseeism. We may infer, both from the peculiar character of his mind, and from what he has here and there said of himself, that he strove to surpass all those of his own age in the practice of legal piety according to the tenets of the severer Phariseeism. But well might Paul—the more earnest his endeavours after holiness were, the more he had to combat with the perverse impulses of a fiery and passionate nature, which would not be held in check by the curb of the law,—have so much the more occasion to learn from his own experience the unholy disunion in the nature of man, which arises where the moral consciousness makes its power felt as an authoritative law, while the man ever feels himself hurried away by the power of ungodly propensities, against his better will and desire. Paul could never have described this situation in so vivid and striking a manner in the seventh chapter of Romans, had he not thus learned it from his own experience. It was important for him, that he went over to the gospel from a situation where the great aim was, by all kinds of artificial hedges and barriers, to protect one's self against the might of the desires and passions, and force one's self to good;¹ in order that at a later period, he might testify from his own personal experience, in which he appears as the representative of all those who are capable of earnest moral effort, how deeply the feeling of the need of atonement is seated in the very nature of mankind; in order that he might be able to portray from his own experience, the relation existing between that internal freedom which proceeds from faith in an atonement, and the bondage of the legal state. Paul as a Pharisee in conflict with himself, doubtless had experiences similar to those of Luther in the cloister of Erfurdt.

Although in the pharisean dialectics and interpretation of the law, he was a faithful and zealous disciple of Gamaliel, still we cannot thence infer, that the spirit of moderation by which Gamaliel is said to have been distinguished, and

¹ As e. g. from the pharisaic point of view it is said: Instead of leaving all to the free course of the disposition, one should compel himself to do this or that good action by a vow. Vows are the hedges of sanctity, נְדָרִים סִיג בְּטָרִישָׁדָת. See *Pirke Avoth* § 13.

which at first displayed itself in his opinion respecting the new sect,¹ before this came in conflict with the theology of the Pharisees, passed over in like manner upon Paul. For the disciple, especially a disciple of so energetic and peculiar a spirit, appropriates to himself the intellectual influence of his teacher, only so far as this is in harmony with his own disposition of mind. The sternness of Paul's disposition, the fire of his nature, and the fire of his youth, combined to render him a vehement persecuting zealot, against every thing opposed to that system which he regarded as alone holy. And as now, through the views of Stephen, the new doctrines seemed to take a more hostile turn against the pharisean theology, he therefore became the most vehement persecutor of these doctrines. After the martyrdom of Stephen, when many followers of the gospel had sought refuge in foreign lands, he felt himself called to act against the new sect in the city of Damascus, where it had gained many adherents. And he hastened thither, after having received from the Sanhedrim, the highest ecclesiastical tribunal among the Jews and in this respect acknowledged also by the Romans, which had power to punish all violators of the law, full authority for the imprisonment of all Christians.²

In regard now to the great change which was wrought in Paul upon this journey, undertaken as it was by him for the destruction of the christian faith, the hypothesis is certainly possible, that perhaps this great event appears to us as something so sudden and supernatural, only because history has imparted to us simply the result, but not the various preparatory circumstances and connecting links which led to this result; so that by supplying these chasms in accordance with the traces found in history, we may hope to arrive at a natural explanation.

¹ Acts 5: 34 sq.

² If Damascus at that time still belonged to the Roman province, the Sanhedrim could exercise jurisdiction there in accordance with the right every where secured to the Jews, of managing their religious affairs in their own way. Were the city already under the government of the Arabian king Aretas, still the Sanhedrim could count on his support, in consequence of the close connexion in which he stood with the Jews; it is possible even that he was himself a proselyte to Judaism. The Jews in Damascus also could exercise great influence by means of the women, who were almost all proselytes to Judaism. Jos. B. J. 2. 20. 2.

Paul—it may be said on this hypothesis—had necessarily received many impressions, which in a mind so full of love for the truth could not remain without fruit,—the words of moderation from the lips of Gamaliel, the defence of Stephen, to whom he was so kindred in peculiarities of spirit, the view of the death of this first christian martyr. But he was still too closely shut up in the spirit of Phariseism, to give way to such impressions operating upon him against his will. He suppressed them by force; he repelled the thoughts which arose spontaneously in his soul in favour of the new system, as the suggestions of Satan, to whose agency he ascribed this whole revolt against the authority of the sacred traditions; he urged himself into a so much the more vehement rage against the new sect. But nevertheless, these rising thoughts he could not wholly suppress; and the voice of conscience indignant at such fanaticism he could not wholly quench. There arose a conflict within him. As he was now in this state of mind, an external impression was superadded, which brought the previous ferment of his soul to a full crisis. Not far from Damascus, he and his attendants were suddenly overtaken by a violent thunderstorm; the lightning struck near Paul, and he fell senseless and unconscious to the ground. In all this he now recognized the warning and punitive power of the Messiah whom he had persecuted; and while he confounded objective and subjective together, this impression delineated itself in his soul as a visible appearance of Christ. Blinded by the lightning and stunned he arrived at Damascus. But granting that the hypothesis were thus far correct, how is the meeting of Paul with Ananias to be explained on natural grounds? Here too, it is said, we may supply much which history does not expressly mention. As Ananias was a man well known among the Jews for his strict legal piety, it is not improbable that he and Paul had at an earlier period become known to each other at Jerusalem. The thought arose in the mind of Paul, who had heard of the spiritual gifts imparted to Ananias, that perhaps this man, so distinguished among the Christians, might also be commissioned to heal him and deliver him from this sorrowful condition; and while he busied himself with this idea, the vision arose out of it. On the other hand, it is likewise easy to conceive, that Ananias also must have heard something of the great change which had taken place in Paul; but did not perhaps place full confidence in the accounts, until through the vision, which in him too may be thus psychologically explained, his distrust was overcome.

In respect to this explanation, we must first admit the possibility, that the change thus wrought in Paul might indeed have been prepared by impressions of the kind supposed; but then neither the necessity, nor even the probability of such a supposition, can be shown from any thing which history has preserved to us. History indeed furnishes us examples enough of the power of religious fanaticism, even over such minds as in other respects are open to the impressions of truth and goodness,—how, in such a state, they pervert in behalf of their illusion, every thing which ought of right to withdraw them from it. Thus, in the energetic character of Paul, it is not improbable that even in the martyrdom of Stephen he saw only the triumph of the Evil Spirit over the mind of one whom he had seduced into apostasy from the true faith; and that he therefore felt himself so much the more impelled to oppose the spread of doctrines, which could thus hurry to destruction men otherwise distinguished both for their characters and their gifts. Further, were the impression made upon him by a storm of thunder and lightning in connexion with those preparatory circumstances, the only fact which lies at the bottom in this appearance of Christ, there would still be at least this conflicting circumstance, that the attendants of Paul also experienced something similar to that which befel him. This could be explained in their case only by supposing in them a state of mind similar to that of Paul; a state which could have place only in those who were already Christians, or in the way to Christianity. Such persons, however, would hardly be found in the train of the persecutor of Christians.¹

¹ The variations in the narratives of this event in the ninth, twentieth, and twenty-second chapters of Acts, prove nothing against the reality of the transaction. Unimportant differences of this kind may easily arise, in repeating several times the relation of facts which lie so far out of the circle of ordinary events. But these difficulties do not even need to be referred to a different mode of relation in Paul himself, but may well have their ground in a less exact apprehension and report of Paul's language. If too we suppose that the attendants received only a more general impression from the whole transaction, and not one so distinct as Paul's, for whom expressly the vision was intended; that they saw the light indeed, but perceived no definite form or shape; that they heard words, without being able definitely to distinguish and understand them; it is easy in this way to explain, how

Rather than have recourse to such attempts at mere external explanation, it would be easier to consider the whole as an internal transaction within the mind of Paul, an inward revelation of Christ to his higher consciousness; and then we might regard the experience which he had felt in his conflict with himself as a Pharisee, and his impressions from the defence and martyrdom of Stephen, as a preparation by which his soul was rendered susceptible for this internal revelation of the Redeemer. The truth and supernatural character of the event, would lose nothing in this mode of viewing it; for whatever view we may take of the external phenomena, they must still remain only the means by which Paul was prepared for that inward revelation of Christ, from which his whole apostolic energy proceeded. And a perception by the senses can have no greater certainty and reality than a fact of the higher consciousness, through which man is able to receive communications from a world above the world of sense, in which his *true* life has its root,—a fact which he experiences and perceives *in spirit*. And that here was no self-illusion, which can be psychologically explained, is testified by the extraordinary change, which in Paul proceeded from this inward fact, and by his whole apostolic career, which bears witness, as the effect to the cause, to what he had experienced in his inmost soul. But against this hypothesis of a mere inward reality, speaks likewise the manner in which his attendants were affected by what took place; even if we could venture to explain the condition in which Paul arrived at Damascus, from the power of an inward impression.¹

the transaction could be differently represented from different quarters. As the whole event, from its very nature, cannot be judged of according to the laws of ordinary physical communication and perception; so the circumstance that Paul and his attendants did not perceive the very same things, can in like manner prove nothing against the objective reality of the phenomena. We do not know the law according to which communications are made from a higher spiritual world to men living in the world of sense, so as to be able to determine any thing upon these points.

¹ The hypothesis, that the vision by which the conversion of Paul was effected, was the same with that described by him in 2 Cor. 12: 2,—a view which in recent times has been brought forward by several distinguished theologians,—has every thing against it. There Paul

It is particularly important to compare the manner in which Paul himself has represented this event, in his own recorded expressions, in his epistles,—an event which was to him at all times of such high importance, as the commencement of the new portion of his life. As he often testifies in his epistles, in opposition to Jewish adversaries who would not acknowledge him as an apostle, he had an undoubting consciousness that Christ had committed to him the apostleship in the same manner as to the other apostles.¹ Still it would not here be necessary to suppose an external fact; it might be understood, as above, of an inward reality. Paul manifestly speaks afterwards particularly of such an inward communication of Christ, an internal revelation of him to his self-consciousness;² by which, independently of all human teaching, he was enabled to preach Christ. But something further is implied, when Paul appeals to the fact that *he had seen Christ*,³ and through this fact had become an apostle. This could however be referred to a vision in an ecstatic state, like that which Paul himself elsewhere describes.⁴ On the other hand, it is quite another thing, when he places the appearance

describes an elevation in spirit into a higher region of the spiritual world; here, in what occasioned his conversion, is described a revelation of the descended Redeemer to Paul, who was himself conscious of being upon earth. The effect of this vision was at first to depress him; that inward occurrence was connected with an extraordinary exaltation of mind. From the former proceeded the very beginning of his christian consciousness; the latter marks one of the highest moments of inward life, in one who had already lived long in communion with Christ; and who was to be refreshed under the manifold conflicts which he had to sustain, and to be animated anew for his earthly toils, by such a foretaste of the heavenly existence.—Of the definite time of fourteen years there mentioned, no chronological use can be made, other than to regard as false that hypothesis respecting the time of Paul's conversion, according to which this epistle was written just fourteen years later.

¹ He expresses this most fully and strongly, e. g. Gal. 1: 1.

² Gal. 1: 16. The phrase *ἐν ἐμοί* is here most naturally understood of the inward man.

³ 1 Cor. 9: 1. It must be clear to every unprejudiced mind, that this cannot refer to Paul's having seen Jesus during his life on earth, though the fact itself is possible; for this could have nothing to do with his apostolic calling; nor can it refer to a mere perception and acknowledgement of the doctrine of Christ.

⁴ 2 Cor. 12: 2.

of Christ to him on precisely the same footing as all the other appearances of the risen Saviour.¹ And this declaration of Paul has so much the more weight, because, as is apparent from the passage just referred to,² he knew so well how to distinguish a condition of ecstasy from the condition of ordinary self-consciousness.

In all this, however, we presuppose no magical influence upon Paul, by which he was hurried away and transformed against his will. In this view, also, we presuppose a point of contact, of union, with his inward man; without which, that at least which was most essential, the inward revelation of Christ to his higher self-consciousness, would have been impossible,—without which no external impression could have been the medium of this internal revelation; and without which every external impression, however powerful, would have remained only transient. His love for truth and goodness, which lay at the foundation even in his errors, although restrained by the power of passion and prejudice, needed only by a mighty influence to be set free from that which enchained it. A Caiaphas could never, by any miracle, have been transformed into a preacher of the gospel.

Paul naturally could not pass at once from an impression of this kind to new activity. All that hitherto had been to him the motive and end of all his exertions, at once becomes to him as nothing; his predominant feeling is that of remorseful contrition. It was natural, that he could not instantly recover from an impression so overpowering, which was to give a new course to his whole being. He found himself in a condition of inward and outward weakness, from which he could not raise himself. He passed three days without nourishment. It was with him the point of transition from death to a new life; and nothing can serve more vividly to mark his feelings in this last crisis, than the exclamation, which, transporting himself back into his own former condition, he attributes to the soul of one, in whom the consciousness of the inward bondage of the legal state has been aroused, and who, full of longing for deliverance, pours out his whole heart in the words: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death!"³ It is also certainly not probable, that in this condition he would seek for intercourse with others. Intercourse with Jews would now be least of all agreeable to him;

¹ 1 Cor. 15: 5—8.

² 2 Cor. 12: 2.

³ Rom. 7: 24.

and he would scarcely have the heart to search out those Christians of whom he hitherto had been the persecutor. Indeed, solitude alone could be welcome to one in this state of mind. And hence, it is not in itself probable, that the account of the change which had been wrought in him, should have been first brought by others to Ananias.

It is remarkable, that in order to arrive at the full consciousness of a new life; in order to pass from this intermediate state of remorseful contrition to a new and active life in communion with Christ, he was brought into connexion with the already existing christian church, through an agent proceeding from this latter. In communion with other believers he first became a partaker of that in which he could not participate in solitude. When he now implored Christ, who had appeared to him, to help him in his need, to enlighten both his bodily and spiritual eyes, it was promised him in vision, that a man, whom he not improbably knew by reputation and by sight, a known and enlightened member of the church at Damascus, Ananias, should be the instrument of his spiritual and bodily restoration. And when Ananias, in consequence of a divine monition, came to him, Paul recognized the man to whom that vision had referred him, immediately placed full confidence in him, and in communion with him first felt the presence of a new and higher vital power. Ananias likewise introduced him to the other Christians of the city; and after he had strengthened himself for some days in their society, he felt himself impelled to stand forth in the synagogues, and bear his testimony to that cause which hitherto he had so violently persecuted.¹ Whether

¹ It will hardly do to take *ἡμέραι τινές* Acts 9: 19, as denoting the same as *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* in v. 23. But still we cannot prove from these words, that Luke by the latter expression meant to allude to a prior interruption of Paul's residence in Damascus through an intervening journey into Arabia. We may most naturally suppose the order of the succession in Acts to be as follows: The *ἡμέραι τινές* include only the few days which Paul spent with the Christians in Damascus immediately after his baptism; then follows *καὶ εὐθείας*, and straightway, v. 20, i. e. after spending some days among the disciples, he came forward in the synagogues; and then the *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* denote the whole subsequent residence of Paul at Damascus. In this whole interval of the *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*, as to which the book of Acts relates nothing further, we must of course place the journey of Paul into Arabia; of which, without Paul's own mention of it in Gal. 1: 17, we should know nothing.

now it was, that after he had thus borne this first testimony among the Jews, he thought it best to let the impression operate upon their minds without longer showing himself personally among them; or that the machinations of the Jews already impelled him to flight;¹ he took a journey into the adjacent part of Arabia, where among the Jews who resided there in great numbers, he could find a suitable field for the preaching of the gospel. Thence he returned to Damascus. Whether it was that the Jews, whose rage he had already excited by his former announcements of the gospel, so soon as they heard of his arrival in the city, sought immediately to get into their power the man who could be so dangerous to Judaism; or whether he now, by his continued preaching in their synagogues, first aroused their bitterness against him; whatever it was, he had to seek safety in flight, as their lying in wait now put his life in danger. Thus remote was the man, who afterwards shunned no danger connected with his sense of duty in his calling, from every shade of an enthusiasm which seeks for martyrdom, — and that

¹ Schrader, in his *Chronologische Bemerkungen über das Leben des Paulus*, has recently maintained, that the words of Paul in Gal. 1: 16, 17, on account of the antithesis, must be thus explained: "He did not seek instruction in his calling from men; but withdrew himself into the adjacent deserts of Arabia, in order there, in an independent manner, to prepare himself in silence and solitude for his vocation." But the words of Paul certainly give no occasion for understanding them in this way. Had he wished to say this, he would hardly have chosen the general appellation *Ἀραβία*, but rather *ἐρημὸν Ἀραβίας*, or simply *ἐρημὸν*; by doing which he would have distinctly marked the object of this *ἀνιέρχουσα*. Besides, it is most probable, psychologically considered, that Paul, after Ananias had visited him in his solitude, and raised his mind from its depressed state, would not again seek solitude, but rather communion with the believers; and that after having obtained edification and strength in their society, he would immediately feel himself impelled to bear testimony before his former associates in faith. This view is likewise strongly confirmed by the passage in the epistle to the Galatians, where the connexion is as follows: 'So soon as God revealed to me his Son, that I should preach him among the heathen, following this revelation I preached the gospel independently of all men.' This sentiment Paul expresses both in a positive and negative form: 'I conferred not with flesh and blood; I sought instruction in my calling from no human authority, not even from the apostles at Jerusalem; but I journeyed immediately into Arabia, in order there to preach the gospel.'

too even in the first glow of conversion, with which the exaggerations of an enthusiastic fancy so readily connect themselves.¹ He was let down by his friends in a basket; through an opening in a house upon the wall, in order that he might thus elude the vigilance of the Jews, who were lying in wait for him at the gates of the city.²

Having in this manner passed the three years after his conversion,³ he now determined, about A. D. 39,⁴ to go again to Jerusalem, in order to become personally acquainted with Peter, as the man who there enjoyed the highest consideration in the new community, and who took the lead in all concerns of common interest. Being known, however, at Jerusalem only

¹ In this respect he is characterized—and also distinguished from the enthusiast,—by the expression *τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας καυχᾶσθαι*, *to glory in infirmities*, among which he also reckons this flight; 2 Cor. 11: 30 sq.

² Acts 9: 23—25. 2 Cor. 11: 32, 33.

³ That is, three years after his conversion, on the supposition that the *terminus a quo* of the number of years specified in Gal. 1: 18, is the time of his conversion.

⁴ This occurrence in the life of Paul, affords one of the few chronological data for his history. When Paul three years after his conversion fled from Damascus, this city was under the government of Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea; 2 Cor. 11: 32. But as Damascus belonged to the Roman province of Syria, Aretas could have had possession of it only under very peculiar circumstances. They probably were these. The emperor Tiberius, as the ally of king Herod Agrippa, whose army Aretas had defeated, had given orders to Vitellius, proconsul of Syria, to get Aretas either alive or dead into his power. But while Vitellius was about to execute these orders, and while the march of his troops was delayed by various causes, intelligence came of the death of Tiberius, who died in March A. D. 37, and Vitellius was thus induced to give up his expedition. This period Aretas could take advantage of, to get possession of the Roman city Damascus. It is however not probable, that he could have long remained in possession of a city thus seized from the Romans; and it is perhaps most probable, that when the affairs of Arabia were arranged in the second year of the reign of Caligula, A. D. 38–39, Damascus likewise was included. [See Bibl. Repos. Vol. III. p. 264, 266.] If now we place the flight of Paul in A. D. 39, we may place his conversion in A. D. 36, as this occurred three years earlier; and then we must also place the martyrdom of Stephen in about the same point of time. In the want of all distinct chronological accounts in respect

as a persecutor, he was avoided by all; until Barnabas, a teacher of consideration in the church, who as a Hellenist stood nearer to him and may perhaps have had some earlier connexion with him, introduced him to the apostles and other Christians.¹ His hellenistic descent gave occasion to much discourse and controversy with the hellenistic Jews, on the subject of Judaism and the christian doctrines. The question here arises, whether Paul at that time by his Christian polemics already placed himself in the same relation towards the hellenistic Jews which he afterwards sustained; and this again stands connected with the question respecting the first (genetic) developement of his convictions and of his type of christian doctrine. The question is, whether Paul, when he first came to a knowledge of the gospel, immediately recognized its independence of the Mosaic law. To acknowledge this would perhaps be the most difficult of all, for one who had just broken loose from the dogmas of Phariseeism; as indeed we are elsewhere accustomed to find the gospel intermixed with the dogmas of Phariseeism, in those who went over from this party to Christianity. Ananias, the first teacher of the apostle, was generally respected even by the Jews for his legal piety;² and was therefore assuredly far from wishing a disruption of the gospel from the Mosaic ceremonial law. And in general, at the time of Paul's conversion, this was the prevailing tendency among the Christians; for, as we have formerly remarked, it was only in consequence of what took place after the martyrdom of Stephen, that new views in this respect began to open by degrees from various quarters.

But we are not entitled to assume, that these first had an influence upon Paul to determine his mode of thinking.

to the circumstances of the times, it is impossible to arrive in this manner at entire certainty as to the year of Paul's conversion; but still the hypothesis which places it in A. D. 36, has also this in its favour, that then the interval from the time of Christ's ascension till the martyrdom of Stephen and the conversion of Paul, is neither too long nor too short for the events which occurred in the christian church during that period.

¹ Acts 9: 26, 27; comp. Acts 4: 36. According to an account of Clemens Alexandrinus, which however is not sufficiently authenticated, Barnabas had formerly been one of the seventy disciples. Clem. Alex. Hypotypos. in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. II. 1.

² Acts 22: 12.

Indeed, in a man of his great and independent peculiarities, we must not venture to ascribe too much weight to any determining influences from without, through the communication of doctrines and ideas. We ought rather to believe himself, when he affirms with so much confidence, that his manner of preaching the gospel was imparted to him, not from any human instruction, but only by the communication of the Spirit of Christ. The historical circumstances indeed, and also the letter of the discourses uttered by Christ, and the ordinances appointed by him, he must have learned through human tradition; as also in such cases he appeals to tradition,¹ to words spoken by our Lord; but the Spirit of Christ which enlightened him, independently of all human instruction, guided him in his peculiar understanding and peculiar developement of the letter and the materials thus delivered to him. In those, indeed, who conducted *by degrees* the pharisaic Judaism over to Christianity, it might be longer ere the spirit of the gospel had burst the shackles of the pharisaic-Jewish form. But it was otherwise with Paul, in whom Phariseism had declared itself in the sternest opposition to the gospel; and who then, without any such gradual transition, by a sudden crisis had been arrested by the power of the gospel, and from the most vehement opposer transformed into the most zealous confessor of the christian faith;—with Paul, who, as he describes it in the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, after the feeling of bondage had risen in him to the highest point, had broken through to freedom by faith in a Redeemer. In him, as was natural, the bands of Phariseism were at once cast loose; in him opposition to pharisaic Judaism now took the place of opposition to the gospel; as he says of himself,² that every thing which before he prized so highly, he had renounced for the sake of Christ, every thing which before had seemed to him so splendid, he now counted as filth, that he might win Christ. Thus had he probably, from the very first, of himself, through the illumination of the Spirit alone, recognized with greater depth and freedom the essential features of the gospel in reference to its relations with Judaism; without having been first led

¹ 1 Cor. 11: 23; where Schulz justly remarks, that Paul with good reason employs *ἀπό* instead of *παρά*, i. e. received *from* the Lord, not immediately, but mediately. [Comp. Winer, Gram. des N. T. p. 313, 318.]

² Phil. 3: 8.

to take such views by the influence of Peter¹ and those other Christians of hellenistic descent, who had already preached the gospel to the heathen. And thus also it probably happened, that while Paul, as formerly Stephen,² in controversy against the Hellenists unfolded the truths of the gospel more freely from this point of view, he thereby exasperated still more the rage of the Jews. On the other hand, there was opened to him the prospect of a wider field of labour among heathen nations. At this time, as he was praying in the temple, and his soul elevated to God in prayer was rapt above all earthly things, it was made known to him in a vision from the Lord, that he would be able to accomplish nothing at Jerusalem in opposition to the rage of the Jews; but that he was destined to carry abroad the knowledge of salvation among other nations, even to the remotest regions.³ Almost immediately upon this, after a sojourn of no more than a fortnight at Jerusalem, he was compelled by the machinations of the Jews to fly from the city.⁴ He now returned to Tarsus, his native city, where he spent several years;⁵ assuredly not inactive in behalf of the spread of the gospel, which he probably preached to both Jews and heathen in Tarsus and throughout Cilicia; for to him in all probability the churches of Jewish Christians, which we find a short time after in Cilicia, were indebted for their origin.⁶

¹ That is, in case the conversion of Cornelius had already taken place; which by putting together chronological inferences is indeed possible, but not certain. It may be said, that the first account of the spread of the gospel among the heathen at Antioch, would not have created so great a sensation in the church at Jerusalem, had Peter already returned to that city after the conversion of Cornelius.

² Acts 6: 9—14. 9: 29.

³ Acts 22: 17—21.

⁴ Acts 9: 29, 30. Gal. 1: 18.

⁵ Acts 11: 25.

⁶ The silence of the book of Acts in respect to these labours of Paul in Cilicia, certainly proves nothing against them; since the accounts there given of the whole of this period exhibit so many chasms. It might rather, perhaps, be inferred from the manner in which Paul, up to the time of his first missionary journey with Barnabas, is always named after the latter, that he had never before occupied so independent a field of labour. But it may be too, that while it had before been customary to rank Barnabas, the elder and approved preacher of the gospel, before Paul, the younger and less well known preacher,

ART. VII. PHILOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By the Editor.*

1. *De vera Natura atque Indole Orationis Graecae Novi Testamenti Commentatio*, Auctore HENRICO PLANCK. Goetting. 1810. [Reprinted in the *Commentationes Theologicae* of Rosenmueller, Leipz. 1825. Translated in the *Biblical Repository*, Vol. I. p. 638 sq.]
2. *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms u. s. w.* von G. B. WINER, Prof. der Theol. an der Univ. Erlangen, Leipz. 1822. [2d edit. 1825. 3d edit. greatly enlarged and improved, 1830.]
3. *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*, etc. Auctore C. A. WAHL, etc. 8vo. Lips. 1822. [2d edit. 8vo. 1829. 3d edit. condensed, 1831, small folio.]
4. *Lexicon Manuale Graeco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti*, Auctore C. G. BRETSCHNEIDER, etc. 8vo. Lips. 1824. [2d edit. 1829.]

The progress of Sacred Literature in this country, has, of late, been rapid. Five and twenty years ago there were few facilities for the pursuit of it; and a good apparatus for this department of study was a thing almost unknown, and altogether unattainable. For the literature of the Old Testament, there was here and there a copy of the Hebrew lexicons of Parkhurst and Simonis, and occasionally, perhaps, some of an earlier date. Some of the older Hebrew grammars were also to be found; of which Buxtorf's was far the best. But a knowledge of the Hebrew language was confined to a few individuals; and in those schools where it was professedly taught, it was practically accounted as of secondary importance; was studied without the points; and was seldom pursued beyond the elementary

so it was first by degrees and in consequence of the great and active energy of Paul, that this estimate underwent a change. But at all events it would be more advisable to place the date of Paul's conversion, as to which we can in no case arrive at definite certainty, several years later, than to suppose that he passed several years in his native city, inactive in behalf of the spread of the gospel,—he who, as he himself testifies, from the time of his conversion, had felt himself impelled by so urgent an inward call to preach the gospel. Gal. 1: 16 sq. 1 Cor. 9: 16.

* Reprinted from the N. A. Review for July 1826.

principles. The New Testament, in its original tongue, was an object of more general attention, because the Greek language was taught to a considerable extent in all our seminaries. But it was studied just like the Greek of Homer or Xenophon; as forming a constituent part of the national Greek literature, which has descended to us; with little or no reference to the peculiar character of its style and composition; and with a disregard of all those circumstances of time, place, manners, and opinions, which combined to produce that character. This, however, was no more than was to be expected; since almost the only means of pursuing the study of the New Testament, were those which were common to the whole circle of Grecian literature. The helps adapted exclusively to this object were very rare. Even the work of Parkhurst was seldom to be met with; and scattered copies of the lexicon of Schleusner were just beginning to find their way into the country.

So far as it regards apparatus for biblical study, the times are now changed. The important results of the labors of Gesenius in Hebrew grammar have been condensed, and improved, and spread before our countrymen in the Grammar of Professor Stuart; while the valuable Hebrew lexicon of the same author has also been translated by Mr Gibbs. Among the scholars of the continent of Europe, these works have taken the place of all others on these subjects; and they are now as accessible to the students of this country, as to those of Germany. We have also in our own language treatises on Sacred Interpretation and Jewish Antiquities; while other books of a similar kind, and the latest and best lexicons and commentaries on both the Old and New Testaments, are beginning to be extensively circulated.

We would not be understood to say, that the advances made among us in this department of study are yet so great or so general, as those which have been made on the continent of Europe. There are among our countrymen, doubtless, individuals, whose profound researches, and extensive acquisitions in the particular branches to which they have given their attention, may well vie with those of the celebrated philologists of the other continent; but the shortness of the time, which has yet elapsed, and the nature of the demands upon that class of our youth, who alone can be expected to devote themselves to these pursuits, forbid us to suppose, that such should be the general character of those who have as yet embarked in them. It is to the clergy, that we must principally look for the successful cul-

tivation of this species of literature ; and it is hardly necessary to remark, that the life of active and laborious exertion, to which most of them are called at the present day, is ill adapted to that extensive progress in any department, which is usually the result only of long and painful effort directed to a single point, and carried on in retirement from the bustle of the world, and without the pressure of those claims of active and public duty, which, in the case before us, are paramount to every other. We do, however, mean to say, that a redeeming spirit on this subject has gone abroad in the land, which, at no distant day, will lead to the best and highest results. We mean to say, that among our clergy, and indeed among all classes of the community, the impression is strongly and most justly gaining ground, that the Bible is the sufficient and only rule of faith and practice ; that it is, and should be regarded as the only foundation of all christian theology ; and that, therefore, the study of the Bible is, and ought to be, the first and the great object of a theological education. The obvious tendency of views and feelings like these, is to urge men onward in the cultivation of those languages, in which the sacred records were originally delivered, and to the investigation of all those circumstances in the history, and character, and customs of the people, to whom they were first addressed, which may be supposed to have had an influence upon the form and character of the records themselves.

The day, we trust, has passed away, in which the body of our clergy will remain contented to receive their knowledge respecting our sacred books, through the medium of mere translations, or on the authority of commentators. The spirit of the Reformation is again at work ; the rights of private judgment, and the necessity of free and personal investigation, are beginning to be felt on this subject, as they long have been on all others ; and if these be exercised with proper dispositions, the results cannot but be most auspicious. We are not of the number of those, who fear the consequences of the closest scrutiny, or the most profound researches, into either the nature, or history, or interpretation of the records of our religion. We believe the truths, which these records reveal, will shine with purer lustre, when the veil of ignorance, by which they are yet in a measure shrouded, shall have been still farther removed. We know, indeed, that there are those, who are doubtless conscientious in the adoption of different views ; and who regard with alarm all those efforts of critical acumen, that lead to results in any shape

different from those received modes of interpretation, which, originally adopted perhaps without sufficient evidence, have been handed down from generation to generation, without question or examination. Such persons are, no doubt, conscientious in their motives; but it does appear to us, that they are alarmed at a shadow, which their own experience has not enabled them to distinguish from a substance; and that their motives, if traced to the ultimate source of them, will be found to rest on nothing better than the papal maxim, that 'ignorance is the mother of devotion.' It was the glory of the Reformation, that it reversed this maxim, and strove to found a more enlightened system of faith and worship on the unlimited diffusion of knowledge; and we hope it will be the glory of this country to exhibit proof of the protestant maxim in its full extent, as applied to the study of the Scriptures.

To those who have reflected on the subject, it cannot but be evident, that an *intimate* acquaintance with these oracles of our religion, can be acquired only by an attentive study of the originals. The great outlines of divine truth are indeed so prominent and obvious, that no version, however inadequate, can entirely conceal them from view; so that even in the worst translation, there may yet be found all that is essential to salvation. In this secondary form of translation, too, the great body of Christians in every country must necessarily be content to receive the Scriptures. But they who are to be the teachers of religion; who are expected to become familiar with the word of life, that they may illustrate its power, and enforce its application upon their fellow men; ought never to rest satisfied with the imperfect knowledge, which can be acquired through the medium of versions. To the Jewish nation, the Scriptures presented, as it were, the reality of the scenes, and persons, and events, to which they relate, existing in all their freshness, and beauty, and strength, and in the living hues of nature. To us they are like the same scenes, and persons, and events exhibited in a magnificent painting. The life and soul must necessarily be wanting; but if we can, in a measure, transport ourselves back to the circumstances of the Jews; if we can speak as they spoke, and read as they read, and feel as they felt; we may raise our eyes and behold the painting, glowing with beauty and expression, and rich in graceful forms and brilliant coloring. Without such preparation, without this Jewish power and Jewish feeling, we cannot attain to such a view; our eyes will rest

only upon those outlines of the forms and scenes, which are suspended as a key beneath the picture, and which, of course, are destitute of coloring, of costume, of the minuter features, and comparatively of expression. Such, in a degree, must the Bible be to those who read it only in a version. They cannot fully appreciate its power, and majesty, and simplicity ; because they have never viewed it in the only light, which presents these qualities in their own bold relief. They cannot well, as teachers, cause it to produce on others the full effects of its power ; because they have not fully felt that power themselves. As well might the missionary to heathen lands, renounce the idea of acquiring their languages, and spend his life in making his annunciations by the mouth of an interpreter. Why does he, at the very first, set himself to become familiar with their tongues ? In order, assuredly, that he may communicate directly with them ; that thus he may impart to his instructions more force, more energy, more power, by adapting them to those modes of thought, and feeling, and expression, to which those whom he addresses are accustomed, and through which only can he hope to produce upon them any vivid or permanent impression. Why, then, should not our teachers of religion, first of all, resort to the original Scriptures ? Their case, indeed, is the converse of that of the missionary ; but the reasons which hold good in the one, have a still stronger bearing on the other ; inasmuch as the Scriptures are the ultimate fountain, from which all must draw.

While we thus urge attention to the study of the original Scriptures, it is proper to remark, that there are circumstances in our situation, which must necessarily modify our views, and direct our efforts to particular portions, rather than the whole field, of sacred literature. Our country is, in all respects, a new world ; and while, on the one hand, we have no remains of ancient cities, no ' cloud capt towers and gorgeous palaces,' as memorials of former splendor and departed greatness ; so, on the other, the literature which our fathers brought with them, and which has since come over to us, is all in books. We have no manuscripts, venerable for their antiquity and authority. We have no immense public libraries, where books, and manuscripts, and dust have been accumulating for ages. So far, then, as the correction of the sacred text is concerned, we are without instruments wherewith to work ; and cannot therefore hope, in this respect, to make additions to the stock of knowledge. We

must here depend on the results furnished by the labors of our European brethren, who have all the materials exclusively in their own hands. Why then should we spend our time, and waste our strength, to delve in the dust of *minor* criticism, while the way is open before us in all that relates to the general literature and interpretation of the Scriptures? We have materials, or have ready access to them, for the illustration of the language and history of the Bible, the character and antiquities and opinions of the nation to whom it was first given, the doctrines and duties which it prescribes, and the practices which it prohibits. Here, in the walks of *higher* criticism, is a field sufficiently extensive for the exercise of all our powers; a field, which will afford an ample return of precious fruits, and more than recompense all the toil, which the most intense enthusiasm may bestow upon it.

We turn from the discussion of this general topic, to that branch of it which we had more especially in view, when we sat down to write this article. Our purpose is, in connexion with the general subject, to offer some remarks on the character of the language in which the New Testament is written; and to specify some of those branches of study, which seem to be requisite for the full understanding and correct interpretation of that sacred volume.

It is not our intention to enter here into the details of the famous controversy on the purity of the Greek idiom of the New Testament, which, from the days of Henry Stephens (1576) to the time of Blackwall (1727), or perhaps of Palairret (1752), exercised the ingenuity, and employed the pens of most of the learned theologians of the old world; and which, like many other disputes, soon became rather a strife about words than a discussion about things; a contest for victory, rather than an inquiry after truth. The controversy would seem to have arisen, in a great measure, from that idea of *optimism*, which is very commonly associated with the sacred text, and which attaches perfection, in the absolute sense of the word, to every part and portion of that text. If the Bible be the word of God, it must be free from all defects. If the New Testament was given from God in Greek, it must have been given in the best possible Greek, the pure, unadulterated Attic; for this was the standard of the language; and any departures from it, whether Doricisms, or Latinisms, or Hebraisms, were all barbarisms, and therefore to be condemned as imperfections and blemishes, utterly incon-

sistent with the divine original of the volume. This view was supported and defended with the utmost pertinacity; and when facts, undeniable facts, were brought in opposition to it; when it was abundantly shown, that the New Testament contained many words and phrases which were literal translations of Hebrew idioms, and many constructions, which were of ordinary occurrence only in the Hebrew tongue; so far from admitting the validity of the argument drawn from these facts, which in themselves could not be questioned, the other party ransacked the whole circle of Grecian literature to find instances of like phrases and constructions. Just as if, even had the search always been successful, it could be supposed, that the unlearned writers of the gospels, where these Hebraisms prevail most, had derived such idioms from the classic language of the Greek writers, of whom they knew nothing, rather than from the daily usage of their own vernacular tongue.

At the present day, the ground, as stated above, on which the Attic purity of the style of the New Testament was to be supported, appears sufficiently amusing; we might say, perhaps, absurd; were it not, that the same idea of optimism is still very generally connected with the Bible in many other particulars, not more essential or important than purity of style. It was the same feeling, that the Scriptures must be immaculate, which at first took alarm, and denounced all attempts to collect the various readings, that are found in them, as having a direct tendency to prove the Scriptures imperfect, and therefore undeserving of our highest confidence. This, in fact, was extending the idea of perfection, so as to include not only God and his word, and render them immaculate, but also every transcriber and printer of the Bible, since it was first given. In this connexion, we might go farther, and say, that it is the same idea of optimism, which still influences those who hold to the plenary *verbal* inspiration of the sacred records; who assert that every phrase and every word was directly *suggested* to the mind of the writer by the agency of the Spirit; and assign the same lofty and overpowering influence to Paul, when he directs Timothy to 'bring with him the cloak,' as they do to Isaiah, when, rapt in ecstatic vision, he announces the future triumphs of the Messiah's reign.

Time and the power of indisputable facts have, at length, settled many of these questions; and no one any longer feels alarm at the thousands of various readings in the Bible, nor at the many departures from Attic purity, which are found in the dic-

tion of the New Testament. It will ultimately be the same, we trust, with all other questions of a similar nature. As the language of Greece has been more cultivated, and the genuine character of it more clearly understood, it has been seen, that Grecian literature comprehends in itself a wide range of style and expression, extending from the polished elegance of Plato and the Attic sweetness of Xenophon, to the antique forms of Homer on the one hand, and to the later and less pure idiom of Polybius and Herodian on the other. Hence the question in regard to the New Testament became of less importance, when it was apparent that the peculiarities charged upon it, whatever they might be, rendered it not much more unlike the language of the best ages of Greece, than was the style of many of their own writers. At present, all critics seem to have settled down in the same general views; and the following remarks may be considered as exhibiting an outline of the prevailing opinion on this subject.

Whatever may have been the source whence the Greek language derived its origin, it is well known, that, during the most flourishing ages of the Grecian republics, each separate state had its own peculiar dialect. When, under Philip of Macedon, these several republics were, in fact, if not in name, subdued and united under one government; and intercourse between the different parts of the country became more frequent; the several dialects also became by degrees amalgamated into one common language, in which that of Macedonia would naturally have a certain predominance. Still more was such an amalgamation promoted under the reign of Alexander. His armies were composed of men enlisted from every quarter of Greece, who were thus brought into permanent contact, and would hence gradually lose their peculiarity of dialect. The cities and colonies that he founded, were filled with inhabitants collected in a similar manner, whose association would naturally produce similar results. These remarks apply, of course, more particularly to the colloquial language of ordinary life. The language of books, for a time, was less affected. As Athens had long held a sort of supremacy in Greece, and was still regarded with high veneration as the seat of elegant literature and arts; so, when the other dialects fell into disuse, her polished and graceful diction became the standard of the written language, and nominally maintained that rank for several centuries. But the causes which affected the style of colloquial discourse, could not fail to

operate indirectly upon that of books, and, in no long time, to produce a departure from Attic purity. The language thus formed, varying in purity and elegance according to the country, the education, and the taste of different writers; but still inferior to the genuine Attic, and degenerating more and more in the lapse of years, was that which is termed by the grammarians *the common dialect*, ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος, and was current in those latter periods of Greek literature, when the books of the New Testament were written. At a yet later date, the language degenerated still further into the Byzantine dialect, and has ultimately come down to our days in the form of the Romaic or Modern Greek.

But besides this natural progress of deterioration, the Greek language, so far as our subject is connected with it, was subjected to the influence of another cause of a similar nature, and of not less power. In the cities founded by Alexander, were collected inhabitants of various other countries and tongues, besides those of Greece. The language of the latter, however, was the prevailing one, and was the usual medium of communication in the ordinary transactions of business and of life. It is obvious, therefore, that those inhabitants and sojourners to whom Greek was not vernacular, would be compelled to acquire it; and it is no less apparent, that the Greek thus acquired from daily communication with others and not from books, must have been the colloquial Greek, mingled at the same time with many words and forms of expression borrowed from the native language of the speaker. Especially was this the case at Alexandria, and with reference to the Jews. That city soon became the emporium of the world, and was thronged with foreigners from all the nations of the earth. Under the Ptolemies, it became the seat of the later literature, and science, and philosophy of the Greeks; though the language as spoken there, notwithstanding some peculiar forms, does not appear to have so far differed from the *common* Greek, as to merit the appellation of a distinct dialect. This city was a favourite place of resort to the Jews; of whom at least ten thousand are said to have been numbered among its inhabitants. Here was made, at an early period, the Greek version of the Scriptures by the Seventy, which displays, in a remarkable manner, the influence of a vernacular tongue on the words and phrases of another language, partially acquired. Of that version some books, no doubt, are given in a style not far remote from the best Greek of that day; while others, from the hands of translators less skilled in Greek, adhere closely to

the very letter of the Hebrew, and hence exhibit many strange anomalies of language.

What was thus true in an eminent degree of Alexandria, was also, in a measure, the case with the other cities of Egypt and of Asia Minor. In all these the prevailing tongue was Greek; in all of them the Jews were more or less domesticated, and spoke the current language, intermingled with their own idioms. The introduction of Greek into Palestine was later. All the habits and prejudices of the Jews were at war with such an innovation; and it was only stern necessity, arising from the forcible intrusion of foreign domination, and the intercourse of their brethren who flocked from other lands to pay their vows in that city, which brought them to adopt, in any degree, the language of the Gentiles.

There were, then, two principal causes, the operation of which tended to create a departure in the diction of the New Testament from that of the purer ages of the Greek language. The first was the gradual deterioration of the Greek itself; and consisted in the adoption of words and forms of words, belonging to all the different dialects; in giving new significations to words used in the ancient language, as ἀποκριθῆναι to answer instead of to separate, ὀψώνιον wages instead of food, etc. in giving to many words a different, and often a lengthened form, as ἀνάθημα an offering for ἀνάθημα, ἐκχύνω to pour out for ἐκχέω, ἐλεινός compassionate for ἐλεινός, etc. and in the introduction of new words, mostly by composition, as ἀνθρωπάρεσκος gratifying men, αἰχμαλωτίζω to lead captive, ἀποκεφαλίζω to behead, etc. This later language was particularly rich in substantives ending in μα, in adjectives in ῖνος, and in verbs terminating in ῖζω. It exhibited also a few peculiarities in the forms of nouns and verbs, arising from inflection. The other cause, which operated on the diction of the New Testament, was the vernacular tongue of the writers; which gave rise to words, and phrases, and constructions foreign to the Greek, and borrowed partly from the ancient Hebrew, in which their Scriptures were written, and with which the Jews were familiar; and partly from the Aramæan, or Syro-Chaldaic, which was at that time the popular dialect of the Jews in Palestine. All these peculiarities are usually comprehended under the appellation of *Hebraisms*, and are divided by Winer into those which are *perfect*, and those which are *imperfect*. The former consist of such words, phrases, and constructions, as belong exclusively to the Hebrew or Aramæan

language, and must therefore have been derived from it. The latter comprise words, phrases, and constructions, which, although they may be found in Greek authors, were probably derived by the writers of the New Testament from the Hebrew or Aramæan. Of the former species, or perfect Hebraisms, are words formed by the Jews after the analogy of certain Hebrew words, as *σπλαγχνίζομαι* to have compassion, which stands in the same relation to *σπλάγχνα* bowels as רַחֵם to רַחֲמִים; words, which, besides the usual Greek signification, have also another meaning, common to the correspondent words in Hebrew, as *ῥῆμα* thing as well as word, like דָּבָר, *εὐφροσύνη* prosperity, happiness, as well as peace, like שָׁלוֹם; and whole phrases, of which, although the words may be found in Greek, yet the connexion is exclusively Hebraistic, as *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* to accept one's person, to show partiality, like אָפַיִם פָּנִים, *διώκειν τὴν ἀγάπην* to follow after love, to cultivate love, like דָּרַךְ. Grammatical constructions of this kind are, the use of *οὐ πᾶς* for *οὐδεὶς*, in imitation of the Hebrew כֹּל לֹא; the use of *ἐνώπιον* with a genitive, like לְפָנֶיךָ; the periphrasis with *εἰς* and its accusative for the nominative, like the Hebrew use of ל; the form of negative oaths, as *εἰ δοθήσεται*, like אִם, etc. The other class, or imperfect Hebraisms, are either such constructions as are more frequent in Hebrew than in Greek, as *ἅγια ἁγίων* holy of holies, to express the superlative or *most holy*; the use of *εἰς* one for *πρῶτος* first, etc. or such as are equally common in Greek and Hebrew, but which the writers of the New Testament more probably derived from the latter; as the use of the nominative for the vocative, the omission of the pronoun after transitive verbs, etc.

Besides these two causes, there was also a third, which had a more partial effect upon the style of the New Testament. The Jews were necessarily led to apply the Greek language to subjects, which had never occupied the attention of the Greeks, and to express ideas for which the vocabulary of that tongue afforded no appropriate terms. Hence it became requisite to attach to words already existing a new sense, or to coin new words adapted to the exigency. Both of these courses were adopted by the Jews, and especially by the teachers of religion and the writers of the New Testament. Thus, of the former kind, we find *πίστις* faith, *ἔργα* works, etc. and of the latter, *προσωποληψία* partiality, derived from *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* mentioned above.

We have said enough, we trust, to show, that the Greek of the New Testament must necessarily be a very different species of Greek from that which prevailed at Athens in the days of Xenophon and Plato. Standing on this ground, and looking back on the centuries which have rolled away in controversy on this subject, we cannot but view with wonder, and even pain, the strenuous and ill-directed efforts lavished in behalf of a cause, which now seems destitute of any sound support, and which in itself is comparatively unimportant. We may, however, be consoled by the reflection, that all these efforts have led to a more radical investigation, both of the New Testament and of the Greek writers, and to a more profound acquaintance with the history and character of the Greek language in all its relations; just as the persevering, though fruitless toil of the Alchemists laid the foundation for the wide researches and splendid discoveries of modern chemistry.

Out of this view of the character of the style of the New Testament, there is here suggested a practical inquiry, in relation to the propriety of introducing the study of that volume into our preparatory schools. We are aware that such is the usual practice; and that, in this country at least, it is sanctioned by long usage and the authority of distinguished names. But in accordance with the views already expressed, we do not hesitate to enter our protest against it. We have reasons for this course, apart from the character of the language; such as the feeling which is inevitably excited in the mind of a boy towards any book through which he has been driven in the gears of grammatical analysis; a feeling, which not seldom clings to him, from the force of habit, through life. But we do not press such reasons here. Our present objection lies against the style. All that a boy acquires, or is expected to acquire, in those schools, is the words, and phrases, and constructions of the language. Now if he is thus early put to the study of the New Testament, his attention is directed to a style of composition which is not Greek, exhibited in a language which is not pure Greek, and he is in this way required to become a good Greek scholar. As well might a pupil in French commence with the study of the dialect of Canada; as well might a foreigner, beginning to learn English, take up first the poetry of Burns, or the Heart of Midlothian. The consequence of such a course is, that the youth, whose mind is thus preoccupied with a foreign idiom, acquires no perception of the true genius of the Greek, or of its distin-

guishing characteristics ; all to him is confused and indistinct ; whereas, let him pursue a contrary course, and first make himself familiar with the Attic models, and become imbued with their spirit, and he may then come to the study of the New Testament prepared to perceive and estimate at once the peculiarities which belong to it, both in regard to diction and to subjects.

We return to the topic from which we have digressed. From the course of our remarks it is manifest, that were only the *language* of the New Testament to be taken into the account, the lexicography and grammar of it would properly demand a distinct consideration, apart from any which should include the Greek language in general. We now proceed to say, that the circumstances of the nation to which the sacred writers belonged were such, and there are such constant allusions to the history and geography not only of the Jews, but also of the Romans, to their manners and customs, and to their views of religion and philosophy, as to take the New Testament entirely out from the body of Grecian literature, and give to both the philology and interpretation of it a distinct and peculiar character, and render them a proper object of separate and particular investigation. On each of the above topics we shall by and by offer some remarks, in connexion with the questions, which here present themselves to our notice.

What then are the principles, on which this separate lexicography and grammar of the New Testament should be founded ? What are the means, by which the philology and interpretation of it are to be illustrated and supported ? To the first of these questions, the remarks which we have already made, afford an ample reply. The language of the New Testament must be considered in all the relations, which it bears to the Greek in the various stages and characters of that tongue ; and also in reference to the influence, which the Hebrew or Aramæan may have exerted upon it. So far as the signification of words, the general interpretation of the language, and the illustration of the subjects are concerned, all the circumstances enumerated in the preceding paragraph must also be taken into the account.

The language must be compared with that of the Greek writers of the Attic and succeeding ages, and the usage of each individual word traced through them all ; since in no other way can it be determined, whether a word is of good Attic usage, or belongs to the later idiom, or has been introduced by the influence of the Hebrew. The means of making such a comparison, thanks to the

patient diligence of German editors, are now ample in respect to most of the Greek authors, though not for all. To institute the requisite comparison *de novo*, and solely by the aid of one's own personal reading, would indeed be a task, requiring for the accomplishment of it a life, which should not number less than several multiples of threescore years and ten. But with such admirable indexes as those of Xenophon, by Sturz; of Herodotus and Polybius, by Schweighäuser; of Herodian, by Irmisch; and others, which might be enumerated, and the collections made for this special purpose by Wetstein and other commentators, the labor of the comparison is brought within a narrow compass. These indexes often contain within themselves sufficient materials to make out the necessary examination; or, if not, they refer at once to the requisite passages in the text. We are well aware, that index hunting may be, and has been, carried much too far; especially when the index is made the place of ultimate investigation and appeal; but we are unable to perceive any valid objection to the use of them as instruments, as sources of information merely, without placing any implicit reliance on their decisions. It is the prerogative of the present age, that it may avail itself at once of all the results of the labors of past ages, and thus profit by their experience and toil. To renounce this high privilege, would surely be a proof of any thing but wisdom. As well might the mathematician discard the labors of those who have preceded him, and attempt to make out solely from the resources of his own ingenuity the solutions of those problems, which have for ages occupied so many mighty minds, from Pythagoras down through Newton to La Place.

In these investigations, important aid may also be derived from the labors of the Atticists, a class of men who undertook, in their patriotic zeal, to recall the Greek language from its degeneracy, to that high standard of purity and elegance, for which the ancient Attic was preeminently distinguished. They busied themselves in collecting and condemning words and phrases, which, to their taste, lacked something of the true Attic flavour; and with these they contrasted the more ancient and elegant ones of expression. In these niceties, they sometimes went too far, and have thus betrayed their own ignorance; and it has not unfrequently happened, that words, which they condemned, have, in the researches of later critics, been found in good use in the best authors of the purest age of Greek. Still their labours are not without value; and when brought forward

in connexion with the observations of competent editors, they add much to the facility of our investigations. In a particular manner, the work of Phrynicius, as published by Lobeck, exhibits an extent of research into subjects of this kind, which would be credible of scarcely any other than German industry and minuteness of inquiry.

To determine accurately the degree of influence, which the Hebrew has exerted over the style of the New Testament, an extensive acquaintance with that language is obviously necessary. We shall speak more at large on this point, in connexion with another part of our subject. It is sufficient here to remark, that it is not a knowledge of the Hebrew of the Old Testament only, that is important; but also of that idiom, which was the current language of Judea in the age of the Saviour and the apostles, and which was formed from the Chaldee, brought back by the Jews from their exile, and intermingled with the Syriac or Western Aramæan. The words that remain untranslated in the Greek Testament, such as *ταλὶθὰ κοῦμι* (סִיחָא קוּמִי) *damsel, arise!* are mostly of this dialect; which, so far as the Scriptures are concerned, is intimately related to the Hebrew, and differs from it in the forms and choice of words, rather than in construction. In this connexion, also, the earlier writings of the Jews in Greek are of great importance. The Septuagint, especially, throws light continually on the peculiarities of the New Testament; and often constitutes a direct medium through which we may compare the idioms of the latter with the Hebrew of the Jewish Scriptures. This version could not fail to exert a powerful influence on the writers of the New Testament; since it had already become current among the great body of the Jews who lived out of Palestine; and was of such authority, that both Christ and his apostles not unfrequently made their Scriptural quotations in the language of it; and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was not improbably designed to become a circular for all the churches composed of Jews, adduces his citations almost exclusively from the Septuagint. In addition to this, the Jewish apocryphal writings also afford many illustrations of the language of the New Testament; inasmuch as they were written by Jews, and on Jewish subjects. But in regard to all these works, it is manifest that they were written at an earlier period, and before the use of the Greek tongue had become fully prevalent among the Jews; and they are, therefore, with the exception of a few

portions of the Septuagint, far less pure, and exhibit far greater anomalies, than the books of the New Testament, which were composed when the Greek had become more current, and was better understood. This remark cannot apply, however, to the writings of Josephus, who was contemporary with the apostles, and wrote not long after them. His works may, therefore, be advantageously employed to elucidate the style of the New Testament; although, as the friend of princes, and mingling in the higher classes of society, and acquainted with general literature, he has, in a measure, divested himself of those peculiarities of the Hebrew idiom, so frequent and so unavoidable in the colloquial language of the common people; to which the diction of the sacred writers is unquestionably to be referred.

There is another class of writings in Greek, which it has been proposed to employ in illustrating the usage of words in the New Testament. We allude to the spurious gospels, which were partially current in the early periods of Christianity, and which have been collected and published by Fabricius; and also to the writings of the Fathers. To the examination and temperate application of writings like these, with a proper estimate of their value, we have nothing to oppose; but our objection to an extensive use of them is, that, from the very nature of the case, they must be supposed to have closely imitated the style of the New Testament, and can therefore be of no great authority in determining any question respecting the purity or propriety of that style. If that had peculiarities, they would be likely to adopt them; if that departed from the idiom of pure Greek, they also would probably have done the same. In regard to the Fathers, they mostly wrote at a time so long subsequent, and mingled, to such a degree, the peculiarities of the New Testament with the characteristics of the later Greek, that they can properly afford no good criterion for forming any estimate respecting the language of the sacred writers.¹

¹ The Jews who lived out of Palestine and spoke Greek, were called *Ἑλληνες* Greeks, or *Ἑλληνιστὰι* Hellenists; and hence the Greek spoken by them is called *Hellenistic*. This appellation is appropriate, if confined to the Jewish Greek, and to the language of the Fathers, which was in part derived from it. The term has sometimes been improperly extended, so as to include what is more appropriately called the *later Greek*.

Such are the means, in general, which we possess of ascertaining the distinctive character of the *language* of the New Testament. In the application of these means, there must, however, be still some causes of hesitation, which will prevent us, in many cases, from expressing a decided opinion. The sacred writers were mostly unlearned men, belonging to the lower walks of life, and knew little or nothing of any books but their own Scriptures. If Paul, perhaps, must be considered an exception to this remark, yet it is no less certain, that his learning was that of a Jew, and not that of a Greek; and although he quotes from two of the Greek poets,¹ yet there is little probability that he was acquainted with Grecian literature to any great extent. The language of the sacred writers, then, as a general fact, must have been that of ordinary life, acquired not from the study of books, but from the opportunities and necessities of personal intercourse. Now we cannot suppose, or at least we cannot be sure, that the written literature of Greece, which has come down to us, contains every word and phrase, that was current and of good usage in the spoken language. Hence, in regard to particular words in the New Testament, which are not now to be found in Greek authors, it would be too much to say, positively, that they are not Greek, and even good Greek; since, for aught we know, they may have existed in the spoken language, although they have not been preserved to us by the national writers. Were we to look through any one even of the best Greek writers, we should find, no doubt, many words and phrases, which occur in no other of them; but in such a case should we be justified in denouncing such words and phrases as foreign to the Greek? There is also another source of hesitancy, which regards the influence of the Hebrew. We allude particularly to what are described above as *imperfect* Hebraisms, comprising phrases and constructions, which are common to both languages; less frequent perhaps in Greek prose, but occurring often in their poetry. It is denied by Winer, that the colloquial style of the New Testament admits of comparison with the poetry of the Greeks; since the nature and characteristics of the two must be wholly dissimilar. On this question we dissent from him. The language of common life is everywhere full of all those figures of style, which the rhetorician describes as constituting the very soul of poetry,

¹ Aratus, Acts 17: 28; and Epimenides, Titus 1: 12.

and which the more sedate and tranquil character of prose avoids. It is marked by striking metaphors and strong hyperbole; by conciseness so abrupt, that a word often seems to convey a whole train of ideas; by frequent ellipses, where a word or a phrase is omitted, and the omission gives energy to the expression; by sentences begun, of which the conclusion is supplied only by a gesture or a look; in short, by all those characteristics, which accompany the vehement expression of emotion and passion. Now this is the very field, which poetry delights to cultivate. It is here she culls her choicest flowers, and gathers her most precious fruits. In those walks, especially, where poetry exhibits the overflowings of a servid imagination and of passionate feeling, as in the lyric and dramatic style, the very beauty and charm of it consist in the fact, that the language is true to the natural and unrestrained expression of ordinary life. Why, then, may not the poetry of the Greeks be employed to illustrate the words and phrases of the New Testament, which are so manifestly drawn from the language of colloquial intercourse?

We are aware, that this mode of illustration may be carried too far; as was doubtless the case among the former advocates of Attic purity; but the result of it we think will be, that, so far as mere language is concerned, most of the constructions of the New Testament may also be found in the Greek dramatic writers, and in Pindar. It does not hence follow that the sacred penmen derived them from those writers; but it does follow, that the characteristics of the language of ordinary life were common to the Hebrews and the Greeks, and that the loftiest poetry in both these tongues exhibits them in all their strength. So far as the writers of the New Testament are concerned, these peculiarities were probably derived from their native tongue; from the sublime conceptions and glowing expressions of their own poetry; and may, therefore, properly be termed *Hebraisms*; imperfect ones, no doubt, but still Hebraisms, and that to a greater extent, we think, than Winer has been disposed to allow.

We have done with the philology of the New Testament, and pass now to the consideration of the means by which the *interpretation* of it is to be illustrated and supported. So far as these are independent of the mere signification and grammatical construction of words, they must principally be sought, as we have before remarked, in the peculiar circumstances of the Jewish

nation ; in their history, geography, and manners and customs ; which last are connected with, and in part dependent on their language, religion, and philosophy. At the period, moreover, when the New Testament was written, the Jews were under the dominion of the Romans ; and the frequent allusions of the writers to this political state, and to the character and customs of their haughty oppressors, render an acquaintance with the contemporary facts of Roman history and antiquities an object of essential importance.

The Jews were, indeed, a peculiar people ; and their history down to the close of the captivity, is spread before us with sufficient particularity in the books of the Old Testament. From that period until the birth of Christ, they were the sport of every great and every petty conqueror, who chose to direct his arms against them, or bend his course across their territory ; and their fortunes were intimately connected with those of the surrounding kingdoms ; with those of the Seleucidæ on the one hand, and of the Ptolemies on the other ; until at length they fell within the iron grasp of Roman domination. Their particular national history during this period is to be found, partly in their apocryphal books, especially those of the Maccabees, and partly in the works of Josephus. As connected with foreign nations, the facts respecting them have been collected and arranged in modern times by Prideaux, and with still more care, and in a more condensed and attractive form by Jahn, in one of the parts of his great work on Jewish Archæology. On the events of the age in which Christ appeared, and in which the New Testament was written, the works of Josephus constitute a mine, which is yet far from being exhausted. As he was contemporary with those events, and in many of the most important a personal actor, he has described them with a fulness of detail, and a truth of colouring, which cast strong light upon the allusions of the sacred writers. The prominent political characters in the New Testament, of whom we there have only passing sketches ; the Herods, the Agrippas, Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, Felix, Festus, and others ; are here brought forward in bold relief, and exhibited in the full glare of all their vices and atrocious crimes. Were we to speak from our own conviction, we should say, that the comparison of the contemporary history of Josephus affords an irrefragable proof of the authenticity of the sacred books, and more extensive means for the illustration of them, than exists perhaps in any other quarter. He also

narrates at length the Roman history, so far as it is connected with that of his own country; and the downfall of kings, the dismissals of governors and proconsuls, the intrigues, the dissensions, and the crimes of every species, which filled that unhappy land with violence and bloodshed, are all portrayed by him with the painful minuteness and unquestioned fidelity of an eyewitness. It is proper to remark, that his accounts of the affairs of the Romans are generally confirmed, and sometimes elucidated, by the testimony of Tacitus, Suetonius, and others of their own historians.

Nor is a particular acquaintance with both the civil and physical geography of Palestine, and the adjacent territories, a matter of less importance, for the proper understanding and explanation of the books of the New Testament. Where there are so many allusions to the natural scenery of a region, and the reader is so often transported from one part of the country to another, he needs to become, as it were, an inhabitant of the land. He needs to be able to body forth in his own mind, that scenery in all its beauty and prominence; to behold as with his own eyes 'the glory of Lebanon' clothed with fir trees and cedars, and stretching his lofty ridges along the sky; to dwell with delight on 'the excellency of Carmel' crowned with verdure, and 'dipping his feet in the western sea;' to gaze on the lake, and the hills, and the valleys of Galilee; and to rove in imagination over the mountains and among the dells, which surround the sacred city, the queen of nations, and 'the joy of the whole earth.' Without some such power, it is impossible to enter into the spirit, and feel the full force of the narrative and the allusions. The names, indeed, meet the eye, and fall upon the ear; but they are the names of 'things unknown,' and destitute of 'local habitation.' Here, too, the climate is to be taken into the account. The early and the latter rain; the seed time and harvest; the dry and scorching days of summer, contrasted with the coolness and deep serenity of the nights, in which the heavens seem lighted up with living fires; the parched earth, which drinks up the streams, and converts the mountain torrent into a bed of sand; all these are to be known and felt ere we can understand, in their full strength, the frequent references like those to 'a dry and thirsty land where no water is,' to 'the shadow of a great rock in a weary land;' or like those in our Saviour's parable of the sower, or in his conversation with the Samaritan woman.

The civil and political geography of that age, though not less important, is more difficult to be ascertained. The grand natural traits of scenery and climate are permanent and unchangeable, and present at this day almost the very aspect, which they bore two thousand years ago; but all those features which depended on the will of monarchs, or the power of nations, have, like those monarchs and those nations, crumbled into dust. The mutations of Palestine, in this respect, have been great; and they appear particularly so, when we trace the local divisions of the territory, from that first partition under Joshua, which is now perhaps inexplicable, down through the changes, which took place under the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, and then through those which occurred after the exile in respect to the Jews and Samaritans, until at length the whole became subject to the Roman power. At that time Herod the Great was king over all the territory of the twelve tribes; but at his death, Judea and Samaria were given to Archelaus, Galilee and Perea to Herod Antipas, and the country northeast of the Jordan to Philip. When Archelaus was banished on account of his cruelties to Vienna in Gaul, Judea became a Roman province, and was governed by a succession of procurators, under the control of the proconsul of Syria. It was then assigned, as part of his kingdom, to Herod Agrippa the First, whose miserable fate is narrated in the twelfth chapter of the Acts. After his death, it was again governed by procurators, among whom were Felix and Festus. During all this time the boundaries of the province were often varied, by the addition or abstraction of different towns and cities. We have gone into this partial detail, merely to exhibit the confused and perplexed state of the territorial divisions of Palestine at that period, and to show that the investigation of the subject is attended with no little difficulty. If we add to this the similar state of Asia Minor, where it is perhaps impossible to trace with accuracy the limits of the different provinces; and also the changes made by the Romans in the general divisions of Greece proper and Macedonia, where they affixed the ancient names to provinces and regions of far different limits; we may well suppose, that it is not the mere common reader who can accompany the sacred writers in their geographical details, or follow the great apostle of the Gentiles in his various journeys.

Our information on these topics is to be gleaned, principally, from the treatises of Strabo and Ptolemy, and from the passing

notices of contemporary Roman historians, and occasionally of Cicero and other writers ; but especially, as it regards Palestine, from the works of Josephus. These furnish, indeed, but scanty materials ; but they are all we have ; and, taken in connexion with the facts derived from the New Testament, they enable us in most cases to come at satisfactory conclusions. The physical geography is best learned from the observations of modern travellers. Palestine is becoming every year more and more accessible ; and the light which has been thrown upon its natural features by the reports of Seetzen, Burckhardt, Legh, Jowett, the American missionaries, and by Mr. Carne in his delightful 'Letters from the East,' has contributed much to impart spirit and interest to our conceptions of the scenery so often alluded to in the Bible.

The New Testament, as well as the Old, is, in its costume, a national book ; national not only in the references which it makes to the history and geography of the Jews, but also in those frequent allusions which it contains to the manners and customs of the people ; to their dress, their meals, their hospitality, their modes of salutation and habits of social intercourse, their houses, their agriculture, and above all, to the rites and ceremonies of their religion, which exercised an influence over their whole lives and conduct. The ancestors of the nation were wandering *nomades*, without fixed habitation ; and their descendants, when they came out of Egypt, appear to have possessed a similar character, and to have closely resembled those Arabian tribes, which still roam, in the true spirit of oriental liberty, over the dreary deserts on the east and south of Palestine. Many customs the Hebrews had in common with those tribes ; as, for instance, the rights of the *Goël* or avenger of blood, which are still found existing in the East in all their ancient strength, and which Moses was not able to abolish, but only to modify by the appointment of cities of refuge. But the national character of the Hebrews was framed and fixed by the institutions of their great legislator ; their religion, or its external requirements and prohibitions, pervaded every part of the daily occupations and intercourse of domestic and private life. They were to be a peculiar people, consecrated to God, and beloved of Heaven. Their institutions excluded them from all connexion with surrounding nations ; and when in the lapse of time they mingled with the inhabitants of other countries, in the pursuits of commerce, or as the subjects of foreign dominion, still it

was as the clean with the unclean, as the holy with the unholy. They neither ate nor drank with them, nor contracted alliances of friendship. Dispersed among all nations, they were yet separate from all nations. They stood aloof in their pride from all the world, as to this day they stand aloof.

It is needless to remark, that the character of the Jews, and their manners and customs, must be studied principally in the books of the Old Testament. There we have spread before us the original of all their institutions, the very code of legislation, which, in a great degree, formed their character, and established their national peculiarities. Interwoven as the precepts of their Scriptures were with the very texture of their thoughts and feelings, it is only by rendering ourselves familiar with those Scriptures, that we can at all enter into those thoughts and feelings, and comprehend the lofty pride and bitter prejudices of the Jew. Moreover, the religion of the New Testament is founded on that of the Old. Christ came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them; not to repeal, but to establish them with higher sanctions and more powerful motives. Hence, the New Testament is the image of the Old, in precept, in doctrine, in illustration, in language, and expression; it is built upon it, and forms part of the same structure. The former could not be understood without the latter; it would be unintelligible, both in language and in doctrine. Presented to the world in a later age, it naturally wears a different dress; the costume, indeed, is mostly Grecian; while the body, soul, and spirit, are altogether Hebrew.

In this connexion we would again advert to the study of the Hebrew language. We have already urged, in general terms, the cultivation of an acquaintance with the Scriptures in their original tongues; and have spoken of a knowledge of the Hebrew as essential to the accurate comprehension of the philology of the New Testament. But we would speak of it here, as one of the means of acquiring a familiarity with the genius and character of the Jewish people, and of becoming imbued with an oriental spirit; without which it is apparent that the New Testament cannot be fully understood. We hold it to be almost an axiom, that the genius of a nation cannot be thoroughly comprehended and felt, without an adequate acquaintance with their vernacular tongue. It is this which constitutes one of their chief peculiarities. The language of every people contains words and phrases and modes of construction and expression,

springing out of and adapted to their individual characteristics and exigencies; and which, when once introduced and fixed, exercise a controlling power in moulding and fashioning trains of thought and emotion in the plastic minds of the rising generation. The various languages of the earth are the channels through which the thoughts and feelings and passions of the different nations have burst forth upon the world; and to form a correct estimate of the peculiarities of those thoughts and feelings,—of those traits which make them what they are, and render them national in their character,—they must be viewed as they roll onward in those channels which they have formed for themselves. Demosthenes or Chatham could never have been eloquent in the language of France; nor could the gallantry and gracefulness of France find utterance in the more unwieldy phraseology of Germany.

We would not assert, with the emperor Charles the Fifth, that the learning of a new language is the acquisition of another sense; but we have always felt that it was like the acquaintance of a new friend, imparting to us new ideas, and giving us new notions of life and manners. If we may speak from experience, we know of no process which exercises such an expansive power upon the mind, as the study of a language. It is turning over for us a new leaf in the book of human nature, and bringing us acquainted with the modes in which another nation thinks and feels. Besides, the literature of a people, which is only the embodying of their intellectual habits in form and expression, and which is shaped by their circumstances and characteristic traits, can never be accurately viewed through the medium of any language but its own; it can never be transfused into the speech of another country; or if the attempt be made, yet, like the native of a different clime, although it strive to speak another tongue, the features and costume evince at once its foreign birth. The literature of the Jews is in the Hebrew Bible; and if, as most of our readers are aware, it is impossible successfully to transplant into our own language the literary works of contemporary modern nations; how much more groundless is the hope, that this should ever be done, with full success, in regard to the books of a people so remote in time, so unlike ourselves in all that gives individuality to nations, so distinct and marked in all that pertains to character and genius, so unexampled in the circumstances both of their glory and their fall.

But the claims of the Hebrew, and the treasures which it unfolds, would seem of themselves sufficient to stimulate inquiry and enchain attention. The most ancient of languages of which we have any records, distinguished for a simplicity unimitated and inimitable, and exhibiting forms of words and constructions perfectly dissimilar to all the occidental tongues and enstamped with the genius of oriental conception, it presents to the philologist a wide and fertile field, on which to employ his powers and gratify his predilections. Nor are the rewards which it proffers to the man of taste less rich or less important. If it be merit in a narrative, to place the scenes described before the very eye of him who reads, then have the Hebrew narratives this merit. We are present and mingle in the very scenes. We associate with the actors, we converse with them, we feel with and for them. They are to us like intimate acquaintances; they are ever in our thoughts, and objects of our present solicitude. If it be the province of poetry, to awaken in us thrilling emotions; to melt our souls in tenderness, or rouse them to lofty and impetuous feeling; to soothe our hearts by bland associations and images of loveliness, or enkindle within them high and holy aspirations; then does the poetry of the Hebrews take rank above all other poetry. The plaintive simplicity of the royal Psalmist, the sprightliness and beautiful imagery of the sons of Korah, the abrupt and energetic majesty of Isaiah, the exquisite tenderness and pathos of him who lamented over Zion, and the sublime and fervid flights of Nahum and Habakkuk, are without parallel in all that Greece or Rome can exhibit of beauty, or majesty, or pathos. But we forbear. These are but fruits and flowers which spring up by the way, and with which we may regale our languid senses. The object at which we aim lies far beyond; and the Hebrew, with all its attractions, is but an instrument, through which we are to arrive at a higher knowledge of divine truth.

We have spoken of the influence of the Jewish religion upon the writers of the New Testament, and of the intimate relation which their works bear to the books of the Jewish Canon. We might now go on to speak of the philosophy which then prevailed, and to which the inspired penmen have made frequent allusions; and we might point out how far this philosophy exerted an influence on the religious views of that age, or on those more peculiar ones which are developed in the new Testament. But we must content ourselves with simply remarking, that it has

ever been the fate of religion, when brought into contact with philosophy, to be subjected to fanciful speculations and metaphysical reasonings, which have distorted her features and arrayed her in fantastic garments, widely different from the simplicity and grace of her primeval character. Religion has uniformly been the sufferer by the unhallowed connexion; and very rarely has it been her lot to elevate or direct the aims and principles of philosophy. The three great sects of the Jews, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, made their religion altogether dependant on their different philosophical opinions, in regard to which they were at irreconcilable enmity. Their separate views are given with some particularity by Josephus. Traces also of the Greek philosophy are visible in the apocryphal book of Wisdom; and the influence of it could not yet have passed away in the age of the apostles. The use of the term *Logos* by John presents a problem which has never yet been fully solved; and in whatever way it may ultimately be determined, it is obvious that the question embraces the whole range of Platonic philosophy; as well that taught by the distinguished founder himself, as that which flourished in the schools of his successors, the New-Platonists of Alexandria.

Thus far have we attempted to specify some of the fundamental principles, and main branches of investigation, on which the appropriate interpretation and lexicography of the New Testament must necessarily rest. If we have at all succeeded in placing before the minds of our readers our conceptions of the extent and importance of the subject, and of the magnitude of the responsibility connected with it, we shall not have laboured in vain. The cause of truth is great and will prevail; but it must be at the expense of great efforts, great perseverance, and great sacrifices. Whoever would sit down to make himself familiar with the Bible, and to know all that is to be known respecting it, must make this the grand purpose of his life; and even then he will find that 'wearisome days and nights are appointed unto him;' and that it is only in a world of purer light and clearer vision that he can hope to have all his doubts removed and his knowledge perfected.

We have left ourselves but a narrow space to speak of the works whose titles stand at the head of this article. The little tract of Professor Planck first opened the way fully to a correct estimate of the character of the style of the New Testament, and unfolded those philological principles of which the works of

Winer and Wahl and Bretschneider were intended to exhibit the practical application. Though of small dimensions, it is full of large views; and has exerted a wider influence in the critical world than all the ponderous tomes produced during the centuries of the Attic controversy. On this account, and as a specimen of acute and judicious criticism, we would fain hope that it may yet be republished in this country.¹ The author has been for several years employed upon a *Thesaurus* of the New Testament, which shall contain the practical results of all his labours on this subject. This work, if his feeble health will permit him to complete it,² cannot but be in the highest degree valuable and important; though from the specimens of it which we have had an opportunity to see, we should anticipate from it greater improvements in the philology, than in the interpretation of the New Testament.³

Before closing this article, we wish to say a few words on one other topic. The question is often asked, Why should we be indebted to foreign nations for our manuals and other books in sacred literature? Why, especially, should we be thus indebted to Germany, and not rather use the helps, which the English language affords? To the first part of this question we may answer, that it would be needless labour to toil at the composition of elementary books, when such as we want exist already in another country, and can be introduced among us at the expense, at farthest, of mere translation. Besides, in the pressing demands of this country for active labour, there are very

¹ This has since been done in the present work; see Vol. I. p. 638 sq.

² The work in question was never completed. The younger Planck, after years of premature decay, has sunk into the grave; and the few specimens of his lexicon which have come before the public, are probably all that he ever fully prepared. For a further account of this lexicon and of its author, see the Introductory Notice to the Dissertation above mentioned, *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. I. p. 638.

³ The Editor would take this opportunity simply to inform his theological readers, that he is now engaged in revising the Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, formerly published by him, for another edition. The plan which he has adopted, has been already described in this work, Vol. I. p. 553. He would here only remark, that the work needs a much more thorough revision, than he had at first supposed; and has thus far been almost wholly rewritten.

few who have leisure to qualify themselves in the best manner for such undertakings; and of those few, there are probably none, whose time and talents are not devoted to a different and not less important portion of the same field. In regard to the latter part of the question, we have no hesitation in saying, that we take German books, because they are the best for our purpose. In that country, literature of every species is a profession; and there are profound scholars, who are constantly occupied in the processes of instruction, and are therefore able to feel the wants of pupils, and qualified to supply them. With their loose and fanciful speculations, we have nothing to do. We know, that in religion and philosophy they hold, as in other things, the 'empire of the air;' and that the views of many of their writers on both these subjects are erratic; and knowing this, we may be upon our guard. Give us English books of equal value, whether Grammars, Lexicons, or Commentaries, and we will gladly discard the German writers. Such a course would relieve us from much labour, and would exempt the cause of sacred literature from much reproach. But until this is done, or until we have among ourselves more men of talent and research who can devote themselves to this object, they who are in earnest in pursuing these studies, must seek the best helps wherever they are to be found, and however much they may be encumbered with extraneous speculation. We would not, without cause, speak lightly of the present state of sacred literature in England; but it may well be supposed, that at least they are not far in advance of this country, when it is known, that the works of Parkhurst are still the standard helps for the study of both the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. On this topic we would only adopt the words of one of their own very few scholars, who are competent to pronounce a correct decision on this point. We allude to Professor Lee of Cambridge, himself a most signal instance of genius triumphing over all obstacles and all discouragements. In the preface to his translation of Henry Martyn's Persian tracts, he holds the following language; on which we would merely remark, that it applies to the New Testament as well as to the Old, though his subject led him to speak only of the latter; and which we would especially recommend to the notice of those who insist upon the use of English commentators, to the exclusion of those of Germany. "No book, with which I am acquainted, stands so much in need of elucidation, as the Hebrew Bible. From the

times of Grotius to the present day, I believe we can find scarcely one original commentator. And many, even of his remarks, have been borrowed from the Jews. The Dutch and German Commentaries are the books most worthy of the scholar's regard; but many of these are such, as to make it a question, whether they should be recommended or not. Nothing, if we except the dreams of Hutchinson, has come out in England for the last hundred years, in the shape of original investigation. Compilation has long been the order of the day; and names, respectable indeed and valuable in their time, are now appealed to as the only safeguards against innovation, or as instructors in the way of truth. In almost an universal dearth of Scriptural knowledge, this is not to be wondered at; nor is it to be condemned. It is, without doubt, the best and safest path. But it should not satisfy the minds of those who have both ability and opportunity for making further progress. And as the character of the times in which we live calls for such exertion, it is to be hoped, that the call will not be disregarded.' To a testimony like this, we cannot wish to add a single word.

ART. VIII. ON THE EXPRESSION: "HE SHALL BE CALLED A NAZARENE." EXPOSITION OF MATT. II. 23.

From Hengstenberg's "Christologie," Vol. II. Translated from the German by the Editor.

MATT. II. 23.

Καὶ ἐλθὼν κατοίκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.

And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene.

We premise here an inquiry respecting the name of the city Nazareth. As we find this name only in the New Testament,

different views in regard to its orthography and etymology might easily arise. Our own view is as follows: The name was strictly and originally נֶצֶר; as the name of a city it received in Aramæan the feminine ending א; and finally, on account of the originally appellative signification of the word, ת was sometimes appended to mark the *status emphaticus* of the feminine in א. We have an analogous example in the name Dalmanutha, the same place which is called by the Talmudists דַּלְמָנוּת.¹ So also, most probably, in γαββαθα, גַּבְתָּא, formed from the masc. גַּב, back. That the primitive form was נֶצֶר; that this continued to be used along with the form in ת; and that the ת served merely to mark the *status emphaticus*; or, if we take the Hebrew form, was merely a sharpening of the ה feminine, which for our purpose is the same thing; we show from the following grounds:

1. From the testimony of Jews. David de Pomis says:² "A Nazarene is one who is born in the city Nezer in Galilee, three days' journey from Jerusalem." In the Talmud, in Breshith Rabbah, and in Jalkut Shimeoni on Daniel, Christ is called by the name of reproach *Ben Nezer*, the Nazarene.³ Gieseler indeed has attempted to give to this epithet a different turn.⁴ He supposes it refers to נֶצֶר in Is. 11: 1; and that it first passed over to the Jews from the Christians, who were accustomed to call the Messiah בֶּן נֶצֶר, as being the one promised in Isaiah. This hypothesis, however, is only in so far correct, that the appellation in question was indeed adopted by the Jews with reference to the fact, that the Christians affirmed Christ was the נֶצֶר, branch, announced by Isaiah; just as they also, for a similar reason, applied to him the names נֶצֶר נְאֻסָּה, *adulterous branch*, and נֶצֶר נְהֻשָּׁה, *abominable branch*, from Is. 14: 19.⁵ But it is false, when the rise of this appellation is attributed strictly, or even chiefly, to such a reference as Is. 11: 1. The very appellation itself decides against this; in that case it must have been בֶּן נֶצֶר, but נֶצֶר simply. Gieseler indeed asserts, that he in whom a prophecy was fulfilled, was "the son of that prophecy;"

¹ Comp. Lightfoot *Decas Choragr. Marc. praem. Opp. II. p. 411 sq.*

² In L. De Dieu *Crit. Sac. on Matt. 2: 23.* נֶצֶר מִשְׁנֵלַד בְּעִיר נֶצֶר. הגליל רחוק מירושלים דרך שלשה ימים.

³ See the passages in Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald. Rab. Tal.* 1383. Lightfoot *Disquis. Chorogr. Joh. praem. Opp. II. 578 sq.* Eisenmenger I. p. 139.

⁴ On Matt. 2: 23. *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken* 1831, 3tes Heft, p. 591.

⁵ Eisenmenger I. p. 137, 138.

and appeals in support of such an idiom to the circumstance, that the Pseudo-Messiah under Adrian called himself בן כוכב or בר כוכבא *Bar Cochba*, Son of the Star, in allusion to the כוכב in Num. 24: 17, because in him the star there promised had now appeared. But this confirmation is merely an apparent one;—that Christ was called *Ben Nezer*, as being the one in whom the prophecy of the נֶזֶר was fulfilled, can be as little proved from this circumstance, as it can be proved from the name *Ben Nezer*, that the said Pseudo-Messiah was called *Bar Cochba*, because in him the prophecy of the star was supposed to be fulfilled. Reland has long ago shown,¹ that Bar Cochba probably bore this name, as coming from *Kokab*, a city and region in the country beyond Jordan; and that he made this his derivation so particularly prominent, because in the coincidence of the name of his birth-place with the appellation borne by the subject of the prophecy in Num. 24: 17, he sought a deeper significancy. Further, the supposition that he in whom a prophecy was fulfilled, was called by the Jews the 'son of that prophecy,' e. g. the Messiah, the servant of Jehovah, the prince of peace, the son of the anointed, etc. is destitute of support, and is also in itself improbable. And to all this we may add, that this explanation of *Ben Nezer* is contrary to the constant interpretation of the Jews. Jarchi, in the gloss to the passage in the Talmud, explains בן נֶזֶר as "One sprung from the city Nazareth." Abarbanel, in his book *Majene Hajeshua*, after quoting the passage from Jalkut Shimeoni, remarks: "Observe well how they have interpreted 'the little horn (Dan. 7: 8) of the Ben Nezer,' which is Jesus the Nazarene." Buxtorf² also cites from the Lexicon *Aruch*, a work of great authority: נֶזֶר נֶזֶרִי הַמִּקְלָל, "*Nezer* (or Ben Nezer) is the accursed Nazarene." Finally, it is not conceivable, that the Jews, while heaping the most shameful calumnies upon Christ, should in the very same connexion apply to him an appellation of honour which had been adopted by the Christians.

2. The result thus obtained is further confirmed by the declarations of christian writers. In the time of Eusebius¹ and of Jerome, the place still bore the name of *Nazara*. The latter says, under the word Nazareth: "There is to this day in Gal-

¹ Geogr. II. p. 727.

² Lex. Chald. Rab. Talm. 1383.

³ Hist. Ecc. I. 7.

ilee a village over against Legio, fifteen miles from it towards the eastern quarter, near Mount Tabor, called *Nazara*.”¹ In another place² he expressly identifies the name with *Nezer*: “Ibimus ad Nazareth, et juxta interpretationem nominis ejus videbimus florem Galilaeae.”

3. The gentile names formed from *Nazareth* can be explained only by regarding the *n* as not belonging to the ground form of the word. In that case, the *n* would necessarily reappear in the gentile names, as e. g. from *Anathoth* can be formed only נַחְתּוֹת, and not נְחָתִי. In the New Testament we find only the two forms *Ναζωραῖος* and *Ναζαρενός*; never the form *Ναζαρεταῖος*. Gieseler has felt the difficulties which these appellations present upon the usual hypothesis; but has endeavoured to remove them by the conjecture,³ that the form assumed this peculiar shape in allusion to נָצַר, which the first Christians were accustomed to connect with נִצְרָת. But this conjecture would be at all admissible, only in case the form נָצַרְי, also without the *n*, was not the exclusive one among the Jews, and the Arabic form likewise were not wholly analogous.

We may now inquire in what sense the word נָצַר was applied as a proper name to a place in Galilee. Here the supposition of Jerome (see above) is doubtless to be rejected, viz. that Nazareth was so called as being *the flower* of Galilee; partly because נָצַר never occurs in this sense; and partly because it is improbable, that the place should receive a name which could be appropriate to it only by the rule of contraries, κατ' ἀντίφρασιν. Far more probable is it, that this name was given to the city on account of its smallness,—a feeble twig in contrast with a stately tree. In this sense the word נָצַר occurs in Is. 11: 1. 14: 19, and also in the talmudic idiom, where נִצְרִים denotes *peeled willow rods, twigs of which baskets are made*. Indeed, there was so much the more occasion to give to the place this name, inasmuch as the appropriate symbol was ever present in

¹ Euseb. Onomast. et Hieron. s. voc. “*Nazareth*: est autem usque hodie in Galilaea viculus contra Legionem, in quinte decimo ejus milliario ad orientalem plagam, juxta montem Tabor, nomine *Nazara*.” Comp. Reland, I. p. 497.

² Ep. 17 ad Marcellum.

³ L. c. p. 592.

the environs; the chalky hills around Nazareth being covered with low shrubs and bushes.¹ What these were in comparison with the stately trees which adorned other places, such was Nazareth in comparison with stately cities.

This name, thus applied to the place on account of its small size, was at the same time an *omen* of its subsequent character. The feeble twig never grew up into a tree. In the Old Testament Nazareth is never mentioned, perhaps because it may have been first founded after the exile. Josephus also does not notice it. It was not like most other cities in Palestine, ennobled by recollections from the olden time. Indeed, there rested on it a special disgrace, in addition to the general contempt in which the whole of Galilee stood; just as almost every land has its place or city to which some peculiar reproach attaches, often from accidental circumstances. This is clear, not only from the question of Nathaniel, John 1: 47, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" but also from the fact, that from the earliest times onward the Jews have supposed they were heaping the foulest insult upon Christ, when they called him 'the Nazarene;' while the general reproach which lay on the whole of Galilee was afterwards removed by the circumstance, that the most celebrated of the Jewish academies, that of Tiberias, was situated in it.

Let us now inquire, how far the residence of Christ at Nazareth served for the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. It is every where the declaration of the prophets, that the Messiah, springing from the sunken and decayed family of David, should at first appear without external rank or dignity. The ground-type for all other passages of the like kind, is found in Is. 11: 1, "There shall come forth a rod from the fallen stem of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit;" which Quenstedt has well illustrated thus:² "When now the stem of Jesse, which from humble beginnings grew up in David to the splendour of regal majesty, shall be deprived not only of the regal dignity and external splendour which it received in David, but shall be again reduced to the private condition in which it was before the time of David, and so become like a trunk denuded of its leaves and branches, with nothing remaining but

¹ Comp. Burckhardt's Travels.

² Thesaur. Theol. Philol. I. p. 1015. Comp. the author's *Christol.* I. ii. p. 137 sq.

its roots,—nevertheless, from that trunk so hewn down and apparently dry, there shall arise a royal branch, and from those roots shall spring up a shoot, on which shall rest the Spirit of the Lord.”—In entire accordance with this, it is said in Is. 53: 2, “He grew up before the Lord as a sprout, as a shoot out of a dry soil.”¹ To the נֶצֶר in c. 11: 1, corresponds here the יִרְנָה; to the חֲזָק, the שֹׁרֵץ; to the trunk hewn down, the dry soil; except that by this last, the lowliness of the servant of God is designated generally, while his descent from the now decayed and sunken family of David is not made specially prominent, although of course it is necessarily included in the general idea. The same idea is carried out further in Ez. 17: 22—24. Here, as the descendant of the sunken family of David, the Messiah appears as a small and tender twig, which, plucked by the Lord from the top of a lofty cedar, and planted on a high mountain, grows up into a stately tree, under which all fowls shall dwell. In Jeremiah and Zechariah, in allusion to the figure employed by Isaiah of a trunk hewn down, the Messiah is called the Branch of David, or simply the Branch.² It is surely only necessary here to place together *prophecy* on the one side and *history* on the other, in order to render palpable the exact accomplishment of the former to the latter. Not at Jerusalem, where was the seat of his royal ancestors and the throne of his house, did the Messiah fix his abode; but in the most despised city of the most despised province did the providence of God assign his dwelling, after the prophecies had been fulfilled by his birth at Bethlehem. The name of this despised city, significant of its lowliness, was the same by which Isaiah had signified the original lowliness of the Messiah himself.

We have hitherto considered the prophecies and their accomplishment independently of the citation in Matthew. We subjoin here a few remarks upon the latter.

1. The more general form of quotation, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, in the plural, seems not to have been employed here without ground; although Jerome infers too much from it when he says: “Did he bring forward a definite example from the Scriptures, he would not say, ‘What was spoken by the prophets,’

¹ Comp. *Christol.* I. ii. p. 324 sq. and in *Bibl. Repos.* II. p. 344.

² Comp. the author's *Comm.* on Zech. 3: 8. 6: 12. *Christol.* Vol. II.

but simply, 'What was spoken by *the prophet*;' but now, by using the plural, *the prophets*, he shows that he did not quote from Scripture the *words*, but the *sense*." It is true that Matthew had particularly in view a single passage, viz. Is. 11: 1, which, together with the general announcement of the lowliness of the Messiah, contains also a special designation of it, in the *name* and *omen* of the place where he dwelt. This is apparent from the fact, that otherwise the quotation, *ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται*, could receive no explanation; since it would be violent in the highest degree to assume, that the term "Nazarene" here signifies a humble, despised person in general. But he chose the more general form of citation,¹ in order to denote at the same time the collateral accomplishment, in the residence of Christ at Nazareth, of those prophecies which coincide with that of Isaiah in the chief point, viz. the announcement of the low condition of Christ. But such a collateral reference shows, that this in the mind of Matthew was really the chief thing; and that the coincidence of the name of the city with the name which Christ bore in Isaiah, appears to him only as a remarkable external illustration of the exact connexion of prophecy and its fulfilment; just indeed as he regards every thing in the life of Christ, as brought about by the special guidance of the divine providence.

2. The phrase *ὅτι κληθήσεται* is then likewise to be explained from the circumstance, that Matthew does not limit himself to the single passage in Is. 11: 1, but includes also a reference to the other passages of a similar character. The expression itself, *ὅτι κληθήσεται*, is derived from one of these, viz. Zech. 6: 12, "Behold the man whose name is the Branch." It is therefore not necessary to explain this expression merely from the custom of the later Jews, who attribute to the Messiah that as a name, which serves in the Old Testament to mark some quality or feature of his character,—following in this the custom of the prophets themselves, who often thus employ some quality of the Messiah in the place of a proper name. This hypothesis is untenable, because it would be difficult to produce another instance, where the evangelists, in a quotation announced as literal, have intermingled any thing *de propriis*, relating to proper names.

¹ Comp. Gersdorf, Beitr. zur Sprachcharakteristik, I. p. 136.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. XIV.

APRIL, 1834.

ART. I. ON THE CATECHETICAL SCHOOL, OR THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, AT ALEXANDRIA IN EGYPT.

By R. Emerson, Prof. of Ecclesiastical History, in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

[PART SECOND.]

On the Doctrines taught in the Alexandrian School.

Having traced an outline of the external history of the sacred school at Alexandria, we come now to inquire respecting the doctrines which were taught there. The sources remaining for such an investigation, are the recorded opinions of many of its teachers, and some of its distinguished pupils. This species of evidence is ample, on many important points, with respect to some of the most interesting periods of the school. The true value of such evidence, can at once be estimated; for whatever any teacher published to the world in his writings, we may readily conclude he taught in his more private instructions to his pupils. And what these pupils preached, and taught, we may presume, though with much less confidence indeed, that they imbibed at the school. This latter source, as being less certain, will be but rarely resorted to.

I must also here remark, that my limits necessarily confine me to a bare selection, in some cases, from the materials so amply

VOL. IV. No. 14.

25

furnished, and already, in a great measure, collected or referred to, by such men as Guerike, Martini, Schrökh, Münscher, etc.

My design is, to give a connected view of the sentiments of these teachers on each topic in succession, embraced in this account. In some cases, as already remarked, they have left no works that have come down to us; and in others, they have expressed nothing on certain topics. In both of these cases their names will be passed without notice.

I. INSPIRATION, AUTHENTICITY, AND USE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

On this subject, the Alexandrian teachers generally express themselves with clearness, and appear to have held to the doctrine of a genuine inspiration from God.

Athenagoras represents 'Moses and the prophets as speaking in ecstasy, carried beyond themselves and their own thoughts by the impulse of the Divine Spirit, and uttering whatever he wrought in them. The Spirit employed them as organs of enunciation, in like manner as the musician uses a flute.'¹

This father, like most of those at the same school, was disposed to make much use of human reason and philosophy; but still he regarded the authority of scripture in a much higher sense. Like the rest of the Alexandrians, he held the philosophy of Plato in great admiration; but he would not rely upon it as *proof* where destitute of scripture authority.

Clement speaks decisively in favor of plenary inspiration, and seems even to favor the idea of the *verbal* inspiration of the scriptures. His fault, in fact, is that of believing too much, rather than too little, on the subject of divine communications; for he goes so far as to suppose, that previous to the coming of Christ in the flesh, he had not only made manifestations to the Hebrew prophets, but also, in some sense, to wise men among the heathen: "It is he (Christ) that gives wisdom to the Greeks by inferior angels; for angels were distributed throughout the nations, by an ancient and divine command."² Still Christ made himself known more clearly in the Law and the Prophets, than in the writings of heathen sages and poets; nor would he attribute the same authority to these as to the scriptures. He also assigned a divine origin to the Septuagint.³

¹ Athen. Apol. c. 8.

² Strom. VII. 2.

³ See his Cohort. 1. 5. 6. Strom. VI. 5. Paed. I. 11. II, 10. 12. III 12. I. 22.

Origen is also equally clear and decisive on the topic of inspiration, as might be shown by many quotations. One will suffice. "The sacred volume," says he, "breathes the plenitude of the Spirit; and there is nothing in the Prophets, or the Law, or the Gospel, or the Apostles, which does not descend from the plenitude of the divine majesty."¹ In his work against *Celsus*, and elsewhere, he defends the doctrine of inspiration against just such objections as are now often made, and in the same manner. He contends that all scripture is profitable and intelligible to the humble and studious; but not *at once*, especially in all its three-fold senses. Still he would dissuade the carnal from reading some portions, as the Song of Solomon for instance, because they would only abuse such passages to the purposes of their unsubdued lusts, instead of understanding them. He would have each one study what he is capable of understanding; and affirms, that even the most difficult passages are full of instruction. 'The same God who has provided appropriate food for all kinds of animals, has provided suitable aliment in his word for all sorts of human minds.'

Didymus, the blind catechist, in the fourth century, also expressed his full belief in the plenary inspiration of the scriptures. In his work on the trinity,² he calls them "entirely divine," and "spiritual," *παντελὴς θεία* and *πνευματική*. Other passages might be cited; but it would be needless, as there is no reason to suspect that he or any of these teachers were deficient in their belief of divine inspiration. Their propensity, like that of the times in which they lived, was to believe too much, rather than too little, concerning things of a miraculous nature; to admit the inspiration of some of the heathen, rather than to deny that of the prophets and apostles. Some of them, as *Clement*, seem to have had a vague notion of another divine dispensation beside the Christian and the Jewish, viz. that of heathenism, in which God manifested himself to some men by a kind of *semi-inspiration*; something more than human, and yet not worthy of the full credit to be reposed in his declarations by the mouths of the Jewish prophets.

II. THEOLOGY.

The UNITY of God was maintained by all these teachers.

¹ Homil. on Jeremiah XXI. 2.

² I. 16. 43.

Athenagoras defended it by the authority of the Greek philosophers, and attempted to demonstrate it from reason. He argued thus. If there are two or more Gods, they must either be in the same place, or in different places. The first cannot be, unless these Gods are unequal. And if the second position be adopted, and we suppose one to have created the world, and to be occupied in and about it, then where are the rest of them? And again: "As God the creator of the world, may fill all space, there is no room for another."¹ It is not to my purpose to canvass the *soundness* of this reasoning. Their belief is all we here seek.

Clement, too, supposed that "certain divine qualities are instilled into the whole human race, by which they, and especially the educated, are compelled, however reluctantly, to confess that there is one God, without beginning or end."² He says, that "the manifestation of one omnipotent God, is perfectly natural to all who think accurately; and most of those who have not cast away all modesty in regard to truth, have perceived the eternal beneficence that is exerted according to the divine foreknowledge." And after a multitude of quotations from heathen authors to prove that they had the idea of one supreme God, he goes on to affirm, "that all by nature, and without any aid from instruction, have some perception of the Father and Maker of all things." He adds, that "the whole human race are divided into Greeks and barbarians, no class of whom, whether husbandmen, nomades, or dwelling in cities, can live witho. having anticipated the belief of the superior being. Therefore all nations, whether inhabiting the East or the West, the North or the South, have one and the same original notion, *πρόlepsις*, of him who established the order of things."³ Still he thinks the Greek philosophers derived much of their superior knowledge from the Jews; and that without revelation, none would know how to avail themselves of this light of nature to the purpose of salvation.

Of the moral attributes of God, *Clement* generally speaks with propriety. It may not be improper, however, to show, by a single instance, how he could sometimes *reason* on these attributes. Speculating on the attributes of God's love, he says :

¹ Athen. Apol. c. 6. 7. 5.

² Clem. Cohort. c. 6.

³ Clem. Stromat. V. 13. 14.

“He cannot hate any thing, and yet will that the thing should exist which he hates. Nor does he will a thing should not be, while he is, at the same time, the cause of its existence. Nor does he wish any thing not to exist, which is in being. If then, the *Logos* hates any thing, he wishes it not to be. But there is nothing in existence for which God does not afford the cause for existence. There is therefore nothing which God hates.”¹ Scripture declarations which appear to contradict such a position, we are, according to him, to consider as spoken after the manner of men. We leave, for the present, the author of such reasoning, and proceed to his successor.

Origen, while he held firmly to the unity of God, seems not to have believed, that unaided reason can discover God as he really is. Like the other teachers, he considered God as “distinct in his nature from all created things,” “without change,” “impassible, and without human affections,”—omnipotent, incorporeal, and a simple unity, without parts of which we can predicate “a more or a less;”² as good and just. And yet *Origen* appears to have spoken strangely concerning the divine power; as he affirms that “God in the beginning constituted as many rational beings as he could sustain and manage, ὅσον ἡδύνατο διακρίσσει. For we must pronounce the power of God to be finite, and must not remove its limit under a pretence of praising him. For if the power of God is unlimited, it cannot of necessity comprehend itself; since, from its nature, what is unlimited is incomprehensible. He therefore made as many as he could grasp and keep under his hand and manage in his providence; as he also prepared as much material as he could deck and govern, κατακοσμήσαι.”

In connexion with these declarations, I must add, that *Origen* indulged in some peculiar and rather obscure speculations on the nature of power, or rather of *omnipotence*, as he seems to suppose it as only coextensive with the actually existing objects on which this power can be exerted.³ He regards God as *omnipotent* in the sense of being able to govern all actual existences, in this and all worlds; but he seems to think it improper to speak of his power to govern more than exist. Though God is παντο-

¹ Paed. I. 8.

² De Princip. I. 1. II. 4. 4.

³ Princip. II. c. 9. 1. I. 2. 10. III. 5. 2. Guer. II. p. 185.

κράτωρ, an omnipotent ruler, yet he is not πατοδύναμος, all-powerful. In some passages, Origen seems also to have confounded the wisdom of God, with his power; and this wisdom was the λόγος.

Didymus, who was a great admirer of Origen, and embraced and defended most of his views, seems not to have followed him in these speculations about power. He was remarkable for his knowledge of the Bible, and seems to have had, in fact, a more simple regard to its declarations than most of the Alexandrians. In different passages, he speaks of God, not only as παντοκράτωρ, but also as παντοδύναμος, and παντεξούσιος, and άπειροδύναμος. We may well suppose, that the discussions of a century and an half, from the time of Origen, and especially that the Arian controversy, to which some of these speculations of Origen are supposed to have led, had prepared the way for additional light and increased caution in a truly candid and devout mind, while investigating the great questions that arise concerning the attributes of God. The experience of some ages of fierce discussion and much defection, may have taught him what Origen thought there was no reason to apprehend, viz. the danger of 'removing the limit to divine power, and pronouncing it to be finite.'

This father, like many before him, found it needful to teach most explicitly, that God is a pure spirit, not possessed of body, nor having hands, mouth, and feet, like men. His ideas of God, in some other respects, will appear from the following declarations. "Since God exists above what is invisible, and above what is occult, and above every mind, it is not only impossible for him to come under our vision, or our senses, but he cannot even be inspected by the mind of angels themselves, because he is incomprehensible and inaccessible. For, that God exists, is known to all; but what or how he exists, the speculation of created mind cannot ascertain."

In contending against the Manichæans on the origin of evil, (that most troublesome of all questions in ancient as well as modern times, and which has occasioned more heresies than all other questions put together,) he has the following, as quoted by *Guerike*.¹ In maintaining that neither moral nor physical evil is chargeable on God, he says: "We affirm, that He is not the author of evil, who made a being, that by his own propensity

¹ *Guer. II. p. 335.*

and will, can commit sin. For God made man rational, because he desired that he should be virtuous of his own will, and endowed man with free power to be otherwise, by which he might be turned in either direction; for he wished man to be good by spontaneously choosing what is good; for no one can be virtuous against his will; rather, all the good are voluntarily good. Hence it was needful, that whatever was to be voluntarily good, should possess what is requisite to enable and adapt him to embrace what is good and comely. But it is consentaneous, that a being which could embrace virtue, might likewise embrace vice. Thus made a participant of reason, in order that he might be rendered capable of virtue and vice, the command was given, to practise virtue; but respecting vice, he merely had the capacity for it. For the law of the Creator exhorted and strengthened and aided to virtue; but dissuaded nature from vice. Although, therefore, there is the power in a rational being for the practice of vice, yet he is not sinful for the possession of this power, for of each, viz. virtue and vice, there are powers and choices. Nor is this our opinion merely, but the opinion of all who philosophize correctly about rational beings.—And as virtue and vice cannot be embraced at the same time, and as virtue is pleasing to God, he infused the power of each into a rational being, in order that we may practise the one and abstain from the other. Every one, then, was made rational, that he might be holy and not sinful. If therefore any of the beings in the use of reason, enters on a course which is opposed to the Author and Governor, it is not the fault of the Creator and Legislator, but of those who exert their powers against his provident laws.”¹

Though it is not my object to indulge in critical or theological remarks of my own, yet, on such a passage as the above, may I not be permitted briefly and modestly to propound two questions, for the consideration of such as may be engaged in the like discussions? My first question is this: Does not the above passage contain the essence of all that has ever been said to the purpose on this subject, both as it regards the character of God, and the freedom of man? The second question I would ask, is this: Does not this “blind” theologian of the fourth century, here afford us a signal justification of the encomium, “that he had eyes to see what God sees,” when he assumes it as a first principle, that *simple reason* is all which is necessary to constitute a free agent? Is there the least need of encumbering

¹ De Trin. III. 16.

the discussion with any further considerations about "a power to choose," etc.? "He that KNOWETH to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

III. CREATION.

As a general fact, they rejected the gnostic notions respecting the origin of matter and of spirits.

Clement taught that God was the sole author of creation; but whether he held to the eternal existence of matter in a chaotic state, is not clear.

Origen believed, that God created all things in heaven and earth, out of nothing, by his Son. His speculations concerning the creation of spirits, will best serve to show the nature of his philosophy, and the manner in which he was accustomed to employ it in theological discussions and the explanation of the scriptures.

In conformity with the Platonic doctrines, of which he was very fond, he adopted the belief in the existence of spirits before the visible creation. And in opposition to the gnostic heretics, he supposes these spirits to have been all made originally alike and equal. Not being eternal, but created, they were consequently mutable. What they had received from the hand of God, they might lose or forfeit. Endowed with perpetual freedom of will, some took one course, and some another. Having taken different courses, it was proper that God should deal with them according to their deeds. Hence the grand reason, in his view, for that endless variety and immense difference which are found in the works of creation and providence. It is all to afford different habitations and different circumstances, adapted to the different merits of these spirits, which were all alike at first. He confines not his view to this earth, nor to the spirits that were to become the souls of men. All worlds above, and all beneath, with all their happy or their wretched occupants, are at once embraced. Hence there is one glory of the sun, and another of the moon, and another of the stars; and hence also, one star differs from another in glory. He goes on, likewise, to speak of the diversities among nations and individuals upon earth. "Some are barbarians, and some are Greeks,—some are more and others less savage; some are born under better, and others under worse laws and rulers;—some are born in slavery; some with sickly bodies; and some deprived of hearing, speech, etc."

“One is born of Abraham, according to the promise, another of Isaac and Rebecca, who supplanted his brother *in ventre*, and was beloved of God before he was born. One is born among the Hebrews, where he finds the knowledge of the divine law; another among the wise Greeks; another among the cannibal Ethiopians; or among the Scythians, where parricide is practised as it were by law; or among the Tauri, where they immolate their guests.”

In view of all this wide diversity in the conditions, not only of earthly, but also of “celestial,” and “supracelestial,” and “infernal beings” too, which Origen portrays with an unrivalled hand, he informs us, that ‘many were wont to object, that a world filled with such variety, could not have been created by a *just and good* God; and that especially the gnostics, who came from the school of Marcion, Valentine, and Basilides, accounted for the difference, upon the supposition that either different *kinds* of souls are sent to inhabit different races of men, or that all takes place *fortuitously*.’ This supposition he rejects, as destroying the belief that God made the world, and governs it by his providence, and will judge men according to their works.

Still, Origen himself was not at all more disposed than were those gnostics, with whom he had to do, to resolve this disparity of condition, as we now do, into the sovereignty of God. It was not consonant with his views of divine justice, that men should be born to such diversity of inheritance, without any previous probation. He therefore proceeds to assign them such a probation, anterior to their being doomed to assume the frailties of flesh. It must be acknowledged, however, that he does this with professions of modesty and caution; for he owns, that “none but he that searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God, can know what is the pure truth on this subject. Still,” he remarks, “that we may not nourish the insolence of the heretics by our silence, we will, as men, to the best of our power, answer to the things which they pretend.” He then goes on in the manner already shown, and supposes, that as there is to be a judgment at the termination of the present state of human existence, when men will be rewarded according to their deeds, so there has already been such an award upon the conduct of the same spirits, in a previous state of existence. This he considers as a possible way of replying to the gnostics, and evincing that there is no need of supposing different creators, or different

kinds of souls, nor that calamities are fortuitous, but that all is from the hand and under the providence of a just and good God.

It is rather amusing, at the present day, to see how this zealous father supported his theory from scripture. Like a bold man, he seizes what would seem the very last passage in the whole bible that could be turned to support such a system of previous merit. It was the following: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of him that calleth, it was said, the elder shall serve the younger; as it is written; Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid." How, we ask, can this passage prove his point, instead of refuting it? Like a staunch philosophical theologian, Origen is ready with just as good a reason as has ever been offered against the obvious sense of the passage. It is this. As the Apostle here assures us that God is not *unjust*, and as he certainly would have been unjust, in this discrimination, if Jacob and Esau had performed no previous acts, they must therefore have performed deeds, in a previous state of existence, by which they merited this distinction. When the Apostle inquires, *is there unrighteousness with God*, Origen considers him as only encouraging investigation into the causes of providential distinctions. And as here, according to him, is one instance of distinction on some other ground than that of neither good or evil done *in this life*; so we are warranted in the universal inference, to be applied respecting "creatures terrestrial, celestial, and infernal," viz. that all have had a probation, and their destinations have been allotted according to previous merit. 'The erring creatures sent down to earth, or to the stars, are subjected to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected them, in hope that they would purge themselves and become again vessels of honor prepared unto glory.'¹

He has also something to say in regard to the process of defection in that previous state. From certain passages of scripture, which speak of God as a consuming *fire*, and his angels as a flame of *fire*, Origen supposes God to be of an igneous nature; and his angels and all spirits, in their original state, to have partaken of the same fervid quality. The process of defection, then, in those who relapsed, was that of becoming more or less

¹ Princip. II. c. 9. 2.

cool or cold. And this he argues from what he considers as the derivative import of *ψυχή*, the *soul*, which he derives from *ψυχός*, *cold*. Hence man, in his *lost state*, is *ψυχή*, and no longer *νοῦς*, *mind*. But if he shall purge himself, he will again become *νοῦς*.¹

Though Origen does not suppose any creature perfectly pure in the sight of God, he thinks angels to be the most pure, and devils the most impure, and men and the stars to be intermediate degrees. He supposes some spirits, which had not conducted themselves very basely, are set to preside over the animated bodies of the sun, moon, and stars, to enlighten and adorn the world. Hence he speaks of "the soul of the sun." In his work against Celsus,² he calls the stars "living and rational beings, *ζῶα λογικά*, and active, and enlightened with the light of knowledge by that wisdom which is the effulgence of the eternal light." And commenting on Matthew he remarks: "It is absurd to treat the system of heaven and earth and all they contain, as though the sun and moon, and chorus of the stars, and the angels of this whole universe, were ignorant of the true light, and being ignorant of it, still keep the order appointed them by God." He also proves, from Ps. CXLVIII, that the stars praise God through his Son. He of course regards these bodies as rational and accountable beings, and supposes they will be finally judged. That they are capable of sinning, he proves from Job xxv. 5, "the stars are not pure in his sight." Their souls were made before their bodies, just as in the case of man, which he proves from Rom. viii. 19 sq. where he thinks the 'etherial body is the "vanity" to which the siderial soul is unwillingly subjected in hope of freedom when its service is completed, and that it groans in bondage till Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom, and all will be set free.'³

Origen does not suppose all worlds to have been made at the same time, but one after another; and that there will yet be future creations; indeed, that there has been and will be a series of innumerable worlds. And though he speaks of the world as not being eternal, yet he held, according to Photius, that "the universe, *το πᾶν*, is coeternal with the only wise and perfect God."⁴ And this he argues at length from his notions of power and of the divine immutability, as though there could be no eternal

¹ Princip. II. 8. 3.

² V. 10.

³ Guer. II. p. 190. Princip. III. 5. 3.

⁴ Cod. 235.

creator, without an eternal *creation*, nor an immutable God who should *begin* to create. Thus we see that the same reasoning which is at present employed about an eternal *now*, was employed in the days of Origen, to support a little different point, and with at least an equal degree of obscurity.

God's motive for creation, was from within himself, his own goodness; and as this was the same, without variety, he must therefore have created all *spirits*, which were the first of his creatures, *alike* and *equal*. But when many of these had fallen, his object in creating the *visible* universe, was, to afford suitable places for the punishment and purgation of these lapsed beings, as various in condition as the endless variety of character assumed by them.¹

As to the six days of creation, Origen thinks that none but a fool can understand them as days in the literal sense, as there was no sun nor stars to mark the days at first. He also adduces against the literal interpretation, the declaration, "in the *day* when God made the heavens and the earth."

But perhaps I have dwelt too long on the strange speculations of this great teacher, on the subject of creation. It is pleasing to remark, that he does not appear to have been implicitly followed in them by his successors, though we have not the means of deciding respecting the opinions of most of them, on these points. Didymus, his greatest admirer, has recorded his dissent respecting the animation of celestial bodies.²

IV. PROVIDENCE.

Clement considers the existence of a divine providence, too manifest from the aspect and order of all things, to require proof; and affirms, that the best philosophers have believed in such a providence. He regards the doctrine of so much importance, that if it were removed, the whole economy of salvation would appear a fable. "But the greatest thing in divine providence, is," he says, "that it does not suffer the vice arising from voluntary defection, to remain useless, and that it turns the purposes of the wicked, to some good and useful end."

He makes a broad distinction between God's *permitting*, and his *producing* an event. A brief extract will show both his

¹ Princip. III. 5. 4.

² De Trin. I. 32, 97. II. 6, 192.

doctrine, and his mode of reasoning on the subject. He is combatting the notion of the heretic, Basilides, who held, that the martyrs suffered, under providence, because of their sins committed in a previous state of existence. He says: "It is impious to suppose that these afflictions are from the will of God. For neither did our Lord suffer by the will of the Father, nor do those who suffer persecution, suffer it by the will of God; for if so, then one of two things must be true, either persecution is a good thing, or they who decree and inflict it, are innocent. But yet nothing takes place without the will of the Lord of all things. It remains therefore, briefly to show that things of this nature take place, God not preventing them, *μη καλύσαντος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, for this only saves both the providence, and the goodness of God, *τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον σώζει καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν, καὶ τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. It is not necessary, now, to suppose, that he produces afflictions, for we ought not to think this; but it is meet for us to believe that he does not hinder those who inflict these evils; and that he employs, to a good end, these atrocities of the adversaries."¹ The amount of his doctrine appears to be, that God neither decreed nor produces evil of any kind; but yet, as he is the author of a universal providence, he determined not to prevent evil, and he does not prevent, but turns it to good purpose, such as 'the sanctification of his people and the glory of his kingdom.'

He supposes the stars, which he regards as "spiritual bodies with angels presiding over them," to be employed by providence in an eminent degree, 'as causes of health or pestilence, fruitfulness or famine, and as signs of things past, present, and to come.'

Origen was also a firm believer in divine providence, as comprehending not only God's present management of the world, but also his foreknowledge and purposes. A passage from his work against Celsus, will show at once the cavils of this vain man, and the manner in which Origen regarded and defended the doctrine. Speaking of the predicted treachery of Judas, Celsus says: "He (Christ), being God, foretold these things; and what was predicted must necessarily take place. God, therefore, caused his own disciples and apostles, with whom he ate and drank, to become impious and wicked, while *he* especially ought to have done good to all men, and peculiarly to those

¹ Str. IV. 12. VI. 16. Prophet. Eclog. § 55.

of his own family. Never yet did a man lay snares for one at whose table he was a guest; but this man became a traitor to the God with whom he sat at feasts; and what is more absurd, God himself ensnared those who sat with him at the table, making them traitors and impious. To these things, I reply in the following manner, since thou¹ exhortest me to meet even what appear to me the frivolous pleas of Celsus. Whatever is predicted, Celsus supposes must so take place, because it is predicted. But this we do not concede; as we say, that he who foretells a thing, is not the cause of its taking place, since he foretold what was to be; and as what was to be would have taken place even if not predicted, itself afforded the occasion of its own prediction by him who foresaw it. And the same precedes all foreknowledge of any thing respecting us, whether found in scripture or Grecian history."² Thus, too, in commenting on Genesis, he says: "As there is nothing which has not some cause, while at the first formation of the world, God revolved all future things separately in his mind, he saw that if this thing should be done here, that would follow from it; and thence, a third thing; and from that, another; and thus onward to the end of all things, he saw what would be the consequence. But, still, he is not therefore to be considered as the cause of every sort of thing, why it should take place in this or that manner. For if you see a rash and precipitate man, impelled in his ignorance and by his temerity to commit himself to a slippery path, and you know he will fall by his treacherous steps, still you are not the cause of his fall; just so are we plainly to think of God, who foresees what each one will be, and the causes of his being such, and all the acts he shall perform, whether good or bad. And, that we may freely announce what is fact, not only is God's foreknowledge not the cause of things, (for whom God foresaw would sin, him he does not as it were lead by the hand to the commission of the deed,) but, what is indeed more removed from common apprehension, though still true, the thing itself, which is future, is the cause of such foreknowledge. Neither does the thing take place in consequence of its being foreknown as future; but it is foreknown because it is to be."³

Origen contended strongly, that divine providence is not repug-

¹ Viz. Ambrose, at whose exhortation he undertook the work.

² C. Cels. II. 20.

³ Com. on Gen. quoted by Guer. II. p. 193.

nant to free agency. Of course he disapproved much of the superstition of astrology, as then current. Although he conceded, in his commentary on Genesis, that superior beings might draw prognostics from the situation of the stars, yet he did not believe human affairs to be so controlled by stellar influence, that they could not take place otherwise, 'for this would destroy all freedom, and all ground of praise or blame.'

Origen made a distinction between moral and physical evil. It may be well to inquire how he reconciled both with divine providence. Celsus had said, that "the origin of evil could not easily be known, except by a philosopher, thereby intimating that a philosopher may know it easily; but that a common man could not make the discovery without great labor." To this, Origen replies: "I say, that even a philosopher cannot easily know the origin of evil. Perhaps also he cannot in any manner, unless by the inspiration of God, understand and show what the evils are, and whence they arose, and how they may be removed."¹ But yet, in his next section, Origen himself attempts the solution, at least in part. Still replying to this old adversary, he proceeds: "Celsus, as though he had some secret on the origin of evil, which he would not divulge, and speaking things adapted to the multitude, says: 'It is enough for the vulgar, to say, that evil is not from God, but is inherent in matter, and dwells in mortals.' This is indeed true, that evil is not from God. For it is clear from Jeremiah, that from the mouth of God come not evil and good. But we deny that matter is the cause of evil in man. For each one's own will is the cause of the evil existing in him, and this is itself the evil, τὸ κακόν; and the deeds which spring from it are also evil. Nor is any thing else to be esteemed evil, if we would speak accurately."

On the same topic he says: "We affirm that God is not the author of evil or of vice and vicious actions.—Yet there are a few things, if you look at the structure of this universe, which follow from his distinguished works; just as shavings and sawdust from the fine works of the artists, and as the heaps of dust and fragments of stone around their edifices, may appear to be attributable to the architects."²

Again: "God did not produce evil; yet when found with others, he does not prevent it, though he might have prevented it; but he uses it together with those who harbor it, to necessary

¹ C. Cels. IV. 65.

² C. Cels. VI. 55.

purposes. For through those in whom evil is found, he renders illustrious and approved such as are advancing to the glory of virtue. For virtue, if it meet nothing contrary, does not shine, nor become more splendid and illustrious. Virtue not tried and examined, is not virtue."¹ This he illustrates in the case of the trial of Joseph's virtue.—But "lest any one should seize occasion of strengthening himself in sin, as though sin were beneficial, or might be beneficial to the universe, it is to be remarked, that, although God uses the sin of the wicked to the order of the universe, and accommodates them to its benefit, they are, nevertheless, guilty who perpetrate evil. Inasmuch as they are guilty, although ordained to the general good, they ought to be detested by all. Just as one guilty of certain crimes, who is condemned to public works in the city, which are profitable to all, is said to do something which benefits the whole city, yet he appears to discharge an abominable office in which no one at all wise would wish to be employed. Hence it is that Paul the Apostle of Jesus, teaches us, that even the most abandoned shall be useful to the universe, although themselves shall be banished among the most abominable; but the virtuous shall be the most beneficial to the universe, and shall therefore enjoy the highest place. 'In a great house there are many vessels, etc.'"²

All this is *just*, on Origen's principles, because those who are thus predestinated to be the vessels of wrath, sinned in a previous state of existence, as before shown.

When God sends *physical* evil, it is for moral good, as the physician administers his painful remedies.

In his work on prayer, he gives the reason why God permitted Paul in his youth to become so atrocious a sinner and persecutor of the church, viz. that he might ever after be humble and feel that he was not worthy to be called an apostle. A remembrance of these early sins, is what Origen supposes to be the *thorn in the flesh*, which kept him from being exalted above measure, by the abundance of revelations.

V. THE TRINITY.

Athenagoras has left us only two small works; from which, however, we may form some opinion of his views on certain points of this subject which he briefly touches. It is peculiarly

¹ Hom. in Num. XIV. 2.

² C. Cels. IV. 70.

to be regretted, as regards the deeply interesting inquiry respecting the early opinions of the fathers on the Trinity, that we have so little remaining of the writings of this teacher. As he was among the very first of the converted philosophers who began to teach and to corrupt the simple doctrines of Christianity, had we more of his works, we might, as Martini suggests, have been able to see more clearly the first view which those Platonists took of these doctrines.

In his apology for the Christians, in the time of Aurelius, A. D. 161, he has a passage which shows us how distinctly he contemplated the whole question of the *Trinity in unity*. I give it as translated by Faber.¹ "To this only do we strenuously apply ourselves, that we may know God, and the Word, λόγος, who is from him: what is the unity of the Son with the Father; what is the communion of the Father with the Son; what is the Spirit; what is the unity and the distinction of these which are such; inasmuch as the Spirit and the Son and the Father are united."²

This seems enough to show, that the doctrine of a trinity in unity, was a doctrine *then known*, and not first invented, at a subsequent period, by platonizing Christians. We have also his express declaration, that he accurately set forth the doctrine then prevalent among the brethren.³ And should it now even appear, that these *first* platonizing fathers did not themselves embrace this doctrine, as many contend that they did not, will not the inference be a fair one, so far as it goes, that they were

¹ Since preparing this part of the present article, I have met with an able and interesting work, with the following title: *The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism; or the Testimony of History to the positive Antiquity, and to the Apostolical Inculcation, of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*. By George Stanley Faber, Prebendary of Salisbury, etc. In two volumes, octavo, 1832. The work is not yet published in this country. I have seen fit, in the above instance, and a few others which will be acknowledged as they occur, to substitute his translation instead of my own. I would also here acknowledge my obligation to this author, for a few passages which I had not before selected, from the writings of the fathers now under review.

² Apol. c. 11.

³ Εἰ δὲ ἀκριβῶς διέξυμι τὸν κατ' ἡμᾶς λόγον, μὴ θαυμάσητε—ἔχου δὲ τῶληθὺς εἰδέναι, ἀκριβολογοῦμαι. Athen. Legat. c. 11.

the *corrupters* rather than the *authors* of the doctrine of the trinity?

Let us now endeavor to ascertain, as far as possible, what were the conceptions which this "philosopher," (as he continued to style himself,) actually formed of the divine Persons.

After refuting the charge of atheism, brought by the heathen against the Christians from their worship of only one God, and him invisible and incomprehensible, and immediately after speaking of the nature of the "unbegotten God," he adds: "We acknowledge, also, a son of God, νοοῦμεν γὰρ καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. And let no one think it ridiculous, that God should have a son; for we do not conceive of either God the Father or the Son, like the fabulous poets, who show us gods no better than men. The son of God is the *Λόγος* of the Father, in respect to image and efficiency, ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ; for of him and by him were all things, the Father and the Son being one. And the Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son, in unity and power of spirit, the Son of God is the mind and *λόγος* of the Father. What *child*, παῖς, imports, I will briefly explain. He was the firstborn of God; not as though he had been produced, (for God, being an eternal mind, had τὸν λόγον in himself, always being rational, λογικός); but he proceeded forth from God to be the image and energy, ἰδέα καὶ ἐνέργεια εἶναι προεχθάν, for the 'formation of chaos into an organized creation, according to Prov. viii. 22, The Lord produced me in the beginning of his way, for his work.'¹ He immediately proceeds to speak of the Holy Ghost in the following terms: "We say, that the divine Spirit, which inspired the prophets, is an emanation of God, flowing forth and returning back again, like a beam of the sun. Who, then, would not wonder, at hearing us called atheists, who declare God the Father and God the Son and the Holy Ghost, showing both their power in unity and their distinction in order?"²

These passages, though short, are still sufficient to afford us a specimen of the manner in which this ancient father attempted to conceive of the mystery of a trinity in unity, and to ascertain the manner and the objects of the procession of the Son and the Spirit from the Father. There has been much dispute on

¹ What I have thus marked in half quotation, appears to be the amount of a difficult passage in this author, according to Martini, though some give it a different construction.

² Apol. c. 9, 10.

the question, whether he held to the separate personality of the Son and the Spirit. Münscher argues, that as he does not seem to have regarded the Spirit as a distinct person, therefore he did not regard the Son as such. On the other hand, Guerike contends, that as he appears to have held to the personality of the Son, we are therefore to infer a similarity of views respecting the Spirit. And this he very properly maintains from the following circumstance, viz. that Athenagoras made the character of the Son the main question of the two, and expressed his views more fully upon it. And as he manifestly held to a trinity of some sort, if he made two persons of the Father and the Son, we may well suppose that he regarded the Spirit as a third person; and that it was, therefore, a trinity of *persons*, and not of mere attributes, to which he held. Martini and others contend, that Athenagoras regarded the Son as only the reason or understanding of the Father, proceeding forth to the work of creation.¹

It is to be remembered, that the term *trinity* was not in use at this period, nor had there probably been much speculation on this mystery, till the conversion, in this age, of such heathen philosophers as Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, etc. We are therefore to look rather for the *views* which they seemed to entertain, than for their use of *technical language* on this subject, which in fact did not become decidedly fixed till the middle of the fifth century. Theophilus of Antioch, who died A. D. 183, is the first who is known to have used the term *trinity*.—In the commencement of philosophical speculation on such a mystery, we may well expect to find much variety and obscurity of views, and not a little corruption also, in the course of its progress. The fact of chief value, which we learn from the above extracts, is the distinct recognition of a *trinity in unity* in the divine nature. The precise views which Athenagoras embraced concerning this great mystery of godliness, and by which he attempted philosophically to explain and commend it to the mind of a heathen prince, however interesting in the history of human speculation, would not be of so much importance, even if we could now ascertain them; for, if they should not be found to accord with the Scriptures, we might very naturally suppose him to have corrupted the truth by his vain philosophy. Perhaps, after all, he had himself formed no very definite views of

¹ Münscher, Dogmengesch. II. 443. Guer. II. 101. Martini, von der Gottheit Christi, p 55.

the "unity and the distinction," of which he speaks, as existing between the Father, Son, and Spirit, and which he sought to understand. One thing, however, is clear, viz. that he regarded the Son as *eternal* and "without beginning." His views therefore were neither Arian nor humanitarian; though they may possibly have had a leaning to those which Sabellius afterwards maintained.

As *Pantaenus*, the next teacher, has left nothing that has reached us, we proceed to his successor.

Clement is accused, by Photius, of having 'reduced the Son to a mere creature;' and of having taught that the 'Father possessed two *lóγoi*, of which the inferior one made his appearance among men.' Photius, however, as is supposed by Guericke, might feel a prejudice against Clement, since he did not find, in his works, the technical language which subsequently had come into use on this subject; and therefore his authority as to the opinions of this father, is of less importance.

In the works of Clement, which are preserved, we indeed often find passages which seem to speak of the *lóγος* as the power, or as some property, or attribute of God. The following will serve as a specimen. "The *lóγος* of the Father of all, is not the spoken word, but the wisdom and most manifest goodness of God; and likewise the almighty and truly divine power; the all powerful and sovereign will, which is not unintelligible even to those who do not confess him."¹

Such language from the mouth of a modern polemic, would justly be considered as implying that the man who used it did not consider the *lóγος* as a distinct person, but only an attribute, or a class of attributes in the divine nature. In the writings of an ancient father, however, it implies no such thing, but is in good keeping with their general mode of speculation on the subject. In proof of this assertion, it is urged, that even Athanasius, Tertullian, etc. employed the like phraseology. Some further quotations will show the manner in which Clement used such language even in immediate connexion with other assertions which imply a distinct personality. How his philosophy would reconcile the two modes of speaking, is a question of far less importance to us, than that of the fact respecting his actual belief in a distinct personality. The consistency of his language, and also of his belief, may be called in question without impairing the evidence of his belief itself. The same thing is continually

¹ Strom. V. 1. ed. Werceh. Pat. Opp. Pol. Vol. VI. p. 12.

done in controversies at the present day. What writer in favor of the trinity, is not now considered by his opponents as uttering many things totally inconsistent with this doctrine? And yet they do not doubt his *belief* of the doctrine. Why, then, shall not the same principle be applied to the interpretation of the fathers? My object is not to vindicate or to impugn their faith, but simply to ascertain what it was.

I proceed to passages in which we find this variety of language. Speaking of the free offer of salvation to all men, and Christ's willingness to save all, Clement proceeds: "And neither can it be said that the Lord does not will to save the human race in general, ἀνθρωπότης, because he knows not how to take care of each one; for ignorance does not appertain to God, who was the counsellor of the Father before the foundation of the world, for this was the Wisdom in which the almighty God previously rejoiced. For the Son is the power δύναμις of God, inasmuch as he was the ἀρχικύριτος λόγος of the Father and his wisdom before all derived existences; and he may be appropriately denominated the teacher of those who were formed by him. Nor does he ever, diverted by any pleasure, abandon the care of men; who also even assumed flesh, which by nature is produced possible, and trained it to a state of impassibility. How is he then Savior and Lord, unless the Savior and Lord of all? Yes, he is the Savior of those who believe, because they are willing to acknowledge him; and he is Lord of those who believe not, as they might confess him and obtain the appropriate benefit, he has provided for their case. But all the energy of the Lord has reference to the Almighty, and the Son, so to speak, is a certain paternal energy, πατρική τις ἐνέργεια."¹

I give these passages *in extenso*, instead of selecting merely the phrases which contain the sentiments in question, as the true import of such phrases will thus be more apparent. The inquisitive reader may also be gratified with the incidental notices he will thus find interspersed, respecting other opinions of no small interest at the present day, as that of *general atonement*, the free offer of salvation to *all* men, *election*, etc.

A further proof, that Clement held to a distinct personality and a distinct will of the Son, as well as his mysterious union with the Father, is found in the following passage: "He takes care of all, as it becomes him, being Lord of all; for he is the Savior, not of a part, but of all. He imparts of his beneficence

¹ Strom. VII. 2. p. 368.

according to the adaptedness of each individual, both to Greeks and barbarians, and to those from among them predestinated as faithful and elect, but called in due time. Neither can *he* envy any, who equally invites all, though he eminently rewards such as are distinguished for their faith. Nor can *he* be hindered by any other, who is Lord of all, and specially *subserve* the will of the good and omnipotent Father. On the contrary, envy does not reach the Lord, who is impassible and begotten without beginning, ἀναρχῶς γενόμενον.”¹

In this last phrase, we have a clue to his mode of speculating on the generation, or emanation, of the Son from the Father. Perhaps it was this notion of “eternal generation” which led him to say many things which, taken by themselves, appear to contradict a belief in the eternal personality of the Son. But if he regarded the generation as *eternal*, how should such declarations impair the evidence of his belief in eternal sonship, any more than kindred declarations from others, in ancient and modern times, who have held to the same position?—We proceed to passages in which he further speaks of the divine attributes and works of Christ.

“The most excellent being on earth, is the most pious man; and the most excellent in heaven, is the angel that is nearest in place and the purest partaker of eternal and blessed life. But the most perfect, and holy, and noble, and beneficent, and the most perfectly fitted to rule and to reign, is the nature of the Son, which is most intimately joined to the only omnipotent, ἐν τῷ μόνῳ παντοκράτορι προσεχέσταιη. This nature is of supreme dignity, which ordains all things according to the will of the Father, and governs the universe in the best possible manner, working all things by his exhaustless and indefatigable power, as it inspects and influences the thoughts. For never does the Son of God cease from his inspection; not being divided, not separated into parts, not going from place to place, but being always everywhere, and circumscribed by nothing, all mind, all paternal light, all eye, seeing all things, hearing all, knowing all, scrutinizing all powers by his power. To him are subjected the whole host of both angels and gods.”²

Again, in his Exhortation to the Gentiles, speaking of the Son, he says: “The divine λόγος, who is God most manifest, who is

¹ Ib. p. 386.

² Strom. VII. 2. p. 384.

equal to the sovereign of all, *ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ὅλων ἔξισωθεῖς*." And again : " Now this same *λόγος* appeared among men, who alone is both God and man." " Believe, O man, in man and God ; believe, O man, in him who suffered and is worshipped as the living God ; believe, ye slaves, in him who died ; let all men believe in him alone who is the God of all men." ¹ In his *Pedagogue*, he says ; " Our preceptor, O children, is like God his Father, whose son he is, impeccable, irreprehensible, and impassible in mind ; God in the form of man, unpolluted, obedient to the paternal will ; God the *λόγος*, who is in the Father, who is at the right hand of the Father, and, with the form, is God." ² Again : " God himself becomes man, for such is his will. Heracitus was therefore right in speaking of men as gods, and gods as men ; for the *λόγος* is an obvious mystery ; God in man, and the man God, *θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ ἄνθρωπος θεός*." ³

" In opposition to the Docetæ, he held to the reality of Christ's body, though he did not suppose it, in all respects, like our bodies. It was free from all impurity and all wants. It needed no material sustenance, being upheld by sacred power. When Christ ate, it was merely to prevent those about him from falling into the mistake, that his body was only a phantasm, an error which many had now embraced. ⁴ He elsewhere speaks of the *λόγος* in this body, as a pearl in the shell ; and the body, as a window through which the *λόγος* appears. He says, also, that Christ's body was deformed, which was perhaps only an inference of his from *Is. LIII. 2*. The time of Christ's ministry, he supposes to have been but a single year ; so interpreting *Is. LXI. 1*, where the prophet speaks of " the acceptable year of the Lord." ⁵

A passage, in which he assigns reasons why Christ did not marry, will show, among other things, his view of the sonship of Christ, in some important respects. " There are those who openly pronounce marriage to be fornication, and teach that it was instituted by the devil. These arrogant men also affirm, that they imitate the Lord, who neither married nor possessed any thing in the world ; boasting that they understand the gospel better than others.—They know not the reason why the Lord

¹ *Cobort. I. 7 and 10.*

² *Pæd. I. 2.*

³ *Pæd. III. 1. p. 522.*

⁴ See *Strom. VI. 9.*

⁵ See *Guer. I. p. 145. sq.*

did not marry ; for, first, he had his proper wife, the church ; and then, he was not a common man, that he should need any helper according to the flesh ; neither was it necessary for him to have children, who was *born and forever continues the only Son of God.*"¹ Of course his sonship was previous to the descent of the Spirit at his baptism ; and is likewise different from that of angels and good men, as he is "*the only son of God.*"

Clement speaks of Christ as the teacher of men and of angels, at the first creation of these orders of beings. Tracing back the current of knowledge, from one philosopher to another, he comes to the conclusion, that not even angels, but Christ himself was the source of all knowledge to created beings, their first preceptor, and hence "he is called wisdom by all the prophets."²

The following, as given by Faber, will show at once what was the belief and the practice of Clement in respect to offering prayer to Christ. It will likewise exhibit, incidentally, his exalted view of the Holy Ghost.

"As for what remains, in such a panegyric of the Word, *λέγος*, to the Word let us thus offer up our prayers : O thou, the Instructor, be propitious to thy children. FATHER, CHARIOTEER OF ISRAEL, SON AND FATHER, BOTH ONE, O LORD ! Grant unto us, who follow thy commandments, to accomplish the likeness of thy image, and to apprehend, according to our own strength, the good God and the clement Judge : and grant universally, that, when, in tranquil agreement with the Holy Spirit, we shall wavelessly have sailed over the flood of sin, we, living in thy peace, may be translated to thy city. By night, by day, even to the perfect day, let us offer praise and thanksgiving, to the ineffable Wisdom, to the alone Father and Son, to the Son and the Father, to the Son the Instructor and Teacher, and together also with them, to the Holy Ghost. All things are to the One : in whom are all things : on account of whom, all things are one : on account of whom, is eternity : whose members we all are : whose are the glory, the worlds. To the Good are all things : to the Excellent are all things : to the Wise are all things : to the Just are all things. To whom be glory, both now and forever. Amen."³

I add, likewise, Faber's translation of an ancient hymn, found

¹ Str. III. 6, p. 434.

² Str. VI. 7, p. 242.

³ Pæd. III. 12. Faber, Vol. I. p. 79, 80.

in the works of this father, and doubtless expressive of his views, whether composed by him, or by another hand. It will, perhaps, be grateful to the curiosity, if not to the taste, of the modern reader, to meet with this specimen of the very numerous hymns of the ancient Christians, "in honor," as Pliny says, "of Christ as God."

"O thou, the bit of untamed colts, the wing of wandering birds, the true rudder of infants, the shepherd of the royal lambs; gather together thy simple children, holily to praise, guilelessly to hymn, with innocent mouths, Christ the leader of children."

"O King of saints, O all-subduing Word of the Most High Father, dispenser of wisdom, the age-rejoicing support of the labors of the human race, Savior Jesus, shepherd, ploughman, rudder, bit, heavenly wing of the holy flock, fisher of the saved of all languages, tempting them from the hostile waves of the sea of wickedness with the sweet bait of life: lead, O thou shepherd of rational sheep; lead, O thou holy king of unpolluted children, after the footsteps of Christ; lead, O heavenly way, O eternal Word, infinite age, everlasting light, foundation of mercy, performer of virtue, pious life of those who sing hymns to God, O Christ Jesus."

"Let us infants, nourished with celestial milk, and filled with the dewy Spirit, sing together simple praises, tune hymns, to Christ the king, the holy repayment for eternal life."

"Let us sing together, let us sing with simplicity, the mighty child."

"Let us, choir of peace, the children of Christ, a wise people, jointly celebrate the God of peace."¹

One of the most striking characteristics which mark this hymn, is the accumulation of epithets and titles. In this, it is said remarkably to resemble the old Orphic hymns. Christians had now become but too sadly fond of imitating the heathen in matters of taste, as well as in modes of speculation.

The views of *Origen* respecting the Trinity will be sufficiently indicated by the following extracts. In his work against *Celsus*, *Origen* thus cites and refutes the following objections brought by *Celsus* against the Christians, and which *Origen* supposes may appear forcible to some. "If they worshipped no other but

¹ Hymn. ad calc. Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* lib. III. Faber, Vol. I. p. 61.

one God, they would perhaps have a good argument against others. But now they worship exceedingly, *ὑπερθεραπεύουσα*, this one that has lately appeared ; and yet suppose they commit no fault towards God, although they worship his servant.¹ To this," says Origen, "I reply ; that if Celsus had known this declaration, *I and my Father are one*, and that which was uttered in prayer by the Son of God, *as I and thou are one*, he would not have supposed us to worship any other but the God over all. *For the Father, saith he, is in me ; and I in the Father.* But if any one shall be perplexed by this, lest we desert to those who deny that the Father and the Son are two persons, *ὑποστάσεις*, (perhaps equivalent then to *οὐσίαι*, beings,) let him consider this, *all that believed were of one heart and one mind*, that he may understand the declaration, *I and the Father are one.* We therefore worship one God, the Father and the Son, as I have explained ; and our position remains valid against others. Neither do we adore, thus profoundly, one who has recently appeared, as not existing before ; for we believe him when saying, *Before Abraham was, I am ;* and when saying, *I am the truth.* For no one of us is so much of a slave, as to suppose, that the substance of the truth did not exist before the time of Christ's appearance. We therefore worship the God of truth, and the Son the truth, being two things as to person, *δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα*, but one in unanimity and concord and identity of will : so that he who has seen the Son, the effulgence of God's glory and the portrait of his person, has seen God in him who is the image of God."²

In other passages which follow, it will be seen, that Origen was disposed to make a wide distinction between the persons of the Father and the Son ; but whether he regarded them as dis-

¹ Here and elsewhere, as we have seen, Celsus speaks of it as a fact, that the Christians regarded Christ as truly divine, and worshipped him as God. So did Pliny before him. How strong is such evidence in proof of the *general fact* in those early times ; so general indeed as to be obvious even to heathen. And how different this from the hypothesis, that Christ's divinity and worship were now first taught by these same platonizing fathers, who seem, in fact, more inclined, of the two, to explain away than to invent such dogmas. It is to be remembered, also, that Celsus lived about a hundred years before Origen, and thus his testimony is to the general fact at a still earlier period.

² Orig. C. Cels. VIII. 12.

inct beings in the technical sense in which the term has since been employed, the reader will judge. And that he may the better judge, on this and other points, instead of confining myself to detached phrases, and arranging such phrases all under their appropriate heads, I prefer to give the extracts in their proper connexion, as much as possible; thus leaving for the intelligent readers of this work, as they pass along, to fix for themselves on the several points that may be established by the quotations. As no small part of the confusion and apparent contradiction of both ancient and modern writers on the Trinity, seems to spring from their speculations on the *eternal generation* of the Son, it may be well here to present some passages that bear particularly on this point.

In his work *de Principiis*, a part of which is now found only in the translation by Rufinus, he says: "Tunc deinde quia Jesus Christus ipse qui venit, ante omnem creaturam natus ex patre est. Qui cum in omnem conditionem patri ministrasset, per ipsum enim omnia facta sunt, novissimis temporibus seipsum exinaniens homo factus incarnatus est cum Deus esset, et homo factus mansit quod erat Deus. Corpus assumpsit nostro corpori simile, eo solo differens quod natum ex virgine et Spiritu Sancto."¹

He begins the second book of the same work, by inculcating the importance of distinguishing between Christ's human and divine natures. This divine nature, he says, is designated in scripture, by various terms, as wisdom, etc. "Nec tamen alius est primogenitus per naturam quam sapientia, sed unus atque idem est. Denique et apostolus Paulus dicit, *Christus Dei virtus et Dei sapientia*." "And this wisdom, God beget before the mountains were established, as said by Solomon. Yet this generation is not to be conceived of as at all after the manner of corporeal beings. It is both impious and absurd, to suppose, that God had not eternally the power of producing this wisdom, or divine nature of Christ; or that, having the power, he should not have been eternally exerting it." He continues: "Propter quod nos semper Deum patrem novimus unigeniti filii sui, ex ipso quidem nati, et quod est ab ipso trahentis, sine ullo tamen initio, non solum eo quod aliquibus temporum spatiis distingui potest, sed ne illo quidem quod sola apud semetipsam mens intueri solet, et nudo, (ut ita dixerim,) atque animo conspiciari. Extra

¹ De Princip. Præf. 4.

omne ergo quod vel dici, vel intelligi, potest initium, generatum esse credendum est sapientiam."¹ Yet it is impossible for man to imagine *how* this "eternal and continual generation" should be effected, as he goes on to assure us: "Cui nulla prorsus comparatio non in rebus solum, sed ne in cognitione quidem, vel sensu inveniri potest, ut humana cogitatio posset apprehendere quomodo ingenitus Deus pater efficitur unigeniti filii. Est namque ita æterna ac sempiterna generatio sicut splendor generatur ex luce. Non enim per adoptionem spiritus filius fit extrinsecus, sed natura filius est."² He also speaks of the Son as emanating from the Father; 'but not according to the absurd fables of those who thought the divine nature could be divided into parts.' "It is therefore more as the will proceeds from the mind and yet does not take away any part of the mind, nor is separated or divided from it, that the Father is to be considered as having begotten the Son."³

Many other passages might be adduced, which speak of the divine nature and eternal existence of Christ; but there is not room for them here. Origen considered it just as absurd to suppose any beginning to his existence, as to suppose a beginning to "truth," "wisdom," "power," "life," etc. by which he is designated in scripture. And yet he believed him, in a sense, inferior to the Father, as being mysteriously begotten of him. The Father is the foundation and source of existence as "the unbegotten." In reply to Celsus, who is so fond of pressing Christians on the score of their supreme adoration of Christ, he says: "Be it so, that there are some, among the multitude of believers holding discordant opinions, who precipitately regard the Savior as the supreme God over all; but we do not regard him as such, believing his declaration, *the Father who sent me is greater than I*. We would not therefore place him whom we call Father, beneath the Son of God, as Celsus falsely accuses us."⁴ I add in this connection the famous passage in which Origen speaks of Christ as "second God." The reader will judge, if he can, how much more of separate existence, and of inferiority, is indicated by it, than by the more modern appellation, "second person in the Godhead." "For we are not," says Origen in reply to a cavil of Celsus, "to suppose, that, because the nouns are feminine, therefore *wisdom* and *righteousness* are

¹ De Princip. II. 1, 2.² ib. 4.³ ib. 6.⁴ C. Cels. VIII. 14.

in reality female, which, according to us, are the Son of God, as shown by his disciple, in the declaration, *who became of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.* And although we may therefore call him second God, let them know, that, by second God, we mean nothing else but the virtue, *ἀρετή*, which contains in itself all virtues, and the reason, *λόγος*, which contains in itself whatever of reason there is in things produced according to nature, and as leading causes, and for the benefit of the universe: which reason, we say, was allied and united with the soul of Jesus peculiarly, compared with every other soul, he alone being able perfectly to receive the highest participation of pure (or self-existent) reason and wisdom and righteousness.”¹

Origen ascribes divine attributes and divine works in general, to Christ; but some of them in a higher sense to the Father than to the Son. While he considered Christ as possessing wisdom, righteousness, etc. in *himself*, and even as being the very wisdom of God, he speaks of him as inferior in power. Thus he often speaks of the Father as performing the work of creation through the Son, the Father being the *source* of power. In some places, too, he speaks of the Father as also the source of *moral* attributes, and Christ as the image of these attributes, as they exist in the supreme Father. On the inferiority of both the Son and the Spirit, we find the following. “Yet it appears right to inquire what may be the cause why each one who is regenerated by God unto salvation, has need of the Father and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and cannot be saved without the entire Trinity; nor can possibly participate of the Father or the Son without the Holy Ghost. In discussing these points, it will doubtless be necessary to describe the special work of the Holy Spirit and the special work of the Father and of the Son. Thus God the Father, as he embraces all things, extends to all beings, imparting of his own to each one; for he is the source of being, *ὢν γὰρ ἐστίν*. But the Son is inferior to the Father, extending only to *rational* beings; for he is second to the Father. And the Holy Spirit is still less, extending only to the *holy*. So, according to this, the power of the Father is greater than that of the Son and the Holy Spirit; and that of the Son, than that of the Holy Spirit; and again, the power of the Holy Spirit is superior

¹ Μόνου τελείως χωρῆσαι διδυννημένου την ἄκραν μετοχήν τοῦ ἀπτόλογου, καὶ τῆς αὐτοσοφίας, καὶ τῆς αὐτοδικαιοσύνης. C. Cels. V. 39.

to that of all other holy beings.”¹ He goes on, according to Rufinus, to say, that Christ extends to all men, or exists in them, inasmuch as all, both good and bad, have *reason* dwelling in them, by which they can discern between good and evil, and are moral agents.

Again: “Thus also I think it may be well said of the Savior, that he is the image of the goodness of God, but not goodness itself. Certainly the Son is indeed good; but not as simply good. And although he is the image of the invisible God, and therefore God, yet he is not he of whom Christ himself said, *that they may know thee the only true God*. Thus is he the image of goodness; but not good precisely as the Father.”²

The above passages from Origen are amply sufficient to establish, among other things, the three following positions.

First, it is plain that while he speculated much on the subject of the Trinity, it was not in the same language that was afterwards employed by the Nicene fathers, and their successors; nor perhaps always consistently with them, or even with himself. In fact, the technical language employed by divines on this “great mystery,” was very far from being settled, at the time of Origen. The distinction, for instance, between the terms *person* and *being*, *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία*, as thus used, seems hardly to have been thought of. Origen, indeed, employs them in a different manner when applied to the separate persons of the trinity, from what he does in reference to common beings, as is abundantly evident from the whole scope of the passages in which they are found; but it does not seem to have occurred to him, to make the peculiar distinction and appropriation of these terms, which has since been made. Nor did he use the word *ὁμοούσιος* (of the same substance), which was subsequently introduced; but on the contrary, his nomenclature often seems of a different cast. Still, all this presents no valid proof of his holding to essentially different views from those of the Nicene fathers. Indeed it required one hundred and twenty-five years more after the council of Nice, and the discussions of several councils, too, before the human language on this subject became in a tolerable degree settled and defined. This circumstance is of prime importance in our investigations of the doctrinal history of this period. The chief question does not respect the technical language of these Alexandrian fathers, but the things they

¹ De Princip. I. 3, 5.

² ib. I. 2, 13.

intended, as evinced from the whole tenor of what they have left us.

I therefore proceed to remark, *secondly*, that it is obvious, from the above quotations, that Origen did not consider the union of Christ and the Father, to be such as to constitute them *one person* in any such sense as a single human being is *one*. On the contrary, his great danger on this topic, as we should now regard the use of language, was that of making the distinction so great as to imply not merely two *persons*, but absolutely two distinct *beings*. And this distinction was in the very natures of the Father and the Son, and just as eternal as the existence of the Father and of his "reason." His notion of generation and emanation, whatever it was, certainly precluded the idea of be-
ginning, for so he expressly declares.

It is equally obvious, *thirdly*, that he totally rejected every such distinction as would imply *two Gods*. This might have been shown by much more extensive quotations from his reply to Celsus on this very objection. He was at a great remove from such sentiments as were afterwards broached by Arius.

Let us, then, put these things together, and consider them in connection with the infant state of theology, as a *science*, at that time, and all in connection with the speculative cast of Origen's mind, and we may perhaps be led rather to wonder at the coincidence, than at the discrepancy of his real views, with those of the orthodox generally, in subsequent periods, on these main positions. We may also wonder, after he had himself spoken of the importance of the distinction between Christ's human and his divine natures, that he should make so little use of this distinction in the interpretation of the different classes of texts concerning the Son. A forgetfulness of this distinction, may have caused the greater part of his apparent incongruities. But all could not be expected of one man, or one age, in speculating on so profound a theme. Better still, perhaps, had none ever speculated so far.

Some may still be disposed to inquire, whether Origen believed in the divinity of Christ, in such a sense as to regard him as a proper object of divine worship. On this point of Origen's creed, there has been, and still is, much dispute; and not without some reason.

Were I here to adduce only one class of quotations from this father, I should be guilty of repeating a mockery that has some-

times been practised on the reader. I will endeavor to adduce the most remarkable specimens of each of these different classes.

The first I shall adduce, are rather fitted to explain his views of the *manner* in which we are to approach the Father, though detached parts of them are often urged in proof of his holding to the opinion, that we should worship the *Father only*. They belong to the numerous portion of passages in which he speaks of our addressing prayer to the Father through the Son. Thus he says : " We offer prayers to God through him *who is of a nature between the Unbegotten and all begotten beings*, and who bears to us the beneficence of the Father, and, as a priest, presents our prayers to the supreme God."¹ In the same work, he admits that 'angels are sometimes called Gods in scripture, because they are divine, but yet we are not commanded to worship them in the place of God, and hence they are not really Gods :' " For," he adds, " all supplication, and prayer, and entreaty, and thanksgiving, are to be directed to the supreme God through the high priest over all angels, the living Word, even God. We shall also supplicate the Word himself, and offer entreaty and prayer and thanksgiving to him, if we are but able to discriminate as to the proper language thus to be used in prayer."² Still Origen considered " it as not according to right reason for us to invoke angels," as he declares in the next sentence ; and this, too, when he here calls them *divine*, and speaks of them as " ministering spirits who ascend to the supreme heavens to offer the prayers of men."

Again ; in reply to the plea of Celsus, in behalf of *dæmon* worship, Origen says : " Prayer should be offered to the only supreme God, and to the Word of God, the only begotten, and the first begotten of every creature ; and him we are to entreat, as high priest, to bear our prayer, as it reaches him, to his God and our God, and to his father and the father of all who live according to the word of God."³ And, further on, he speaks of " hymns to him who alone is called *God over all*, and to his only begotten Word and God. And, indeed," he continues, " in hymns we worship, *ὑμνοῦμεν*, God, and his only begotten, as do also the sun and moon and stars and all the heavenly host ; for

¹ C. Cels. III. 34.

² C. Cels. V. 4.

³ C. Cels. VIII. 26.

they all, a divine choir, together with the righteous among men, sing praises to the supreme God, and his only begotten son.”¹

From the above, it is plain, that Origen would have us pray to the Son as *mediator* and as *God*—and yet, through him in this character of mediator, we are also to address the supreme Father, as *the grand object* of worship ;—while angels, though acting as divine *internuntii*, are not to be worshipped at all.

We now turn to an extended passage of a different cast, which we find in his treatise “On Prayer.” “But were we once to comprehend,” says Origen, “what prayer is, perhaps no begotten being ought then to be invoked ; not even Christ himself, but only the God and Father of all, to whom our Savior prayed, as we have before said, and teaches us to pray. For, hearing the request, *teach us to pray*, he does not teach [his disciples] to pray to *him*, but to the *Father*, saying, *Our Father who art in heaven*, etc. For if the Son, as elsewhere shown, is different from the Father, in essence and substance, we must either pray to the Son and not to the Father, or to both, or to the Father alone. But to invoke the Son and not the Father, every one will confess to be most unfit and unwarranted. If both are to be invoked, we plainly ought to use the plural number in prayer, and say, *grant ye, bless ye*, etc. or something of the kind. But as this at once appears improper, and no one can adduce an example of the kind from Scripture, it remains that we pray only to God the Father of all ; but not without the high priest who was appointed of the Father, by an oath, according to the order of Melchisedec.—But as one who would understand most exactly how to pray, ought to invoke, not a suppliant, but the Father whom our Lord Jesus taught us to address in prayer ; so no prayer is to be offered to the Father without him.—For he did not say, *ask me* ; nor simply, *ask the Father* ; but, *if ye ask anything of the Father, he will give it you in my name*.”² And further on, in reply to such as think they ought to worship Christ, because all angels are commanded to worship him, Origen thus quotes and expounds the following declarations : “*Why callest thou me good ? There is none good but one, that is, God*, the Father. As if he should say, *Why pray to me ? Ye ought to pray to the Father only, to whom I also pray, which ye learn from the holy scriptures. For ye ought not to pray to one who is constituted by the Father as*

¹ C. Cels. VIII. 67.

² De Oratione, c. 15.

high priest for you, and who has received of the Father the office of comforter, *παρακλήτος*, but through the high priest and comforter who can sympathize in your infirmities, having been tempted in all points like you, but yet, through the impartation of the Father to me, *διὰ τὸν δωρησάμενον μοὶ πατέρα*, tempted *without sin*.—But it is not rational for such as are deemed worthy of one and the same Father, to pray to a brother. You are then, with me and through me, to pray to the Father only.”¹

This is the strongest passage in the writings of Origen, against addressing prayer to Christ. After diligently comparing it with what he elsewhere says, it will be impossible for any one to wonder at the dispute, which has so long existed, as to the real opinions of this father. The most rational supposition is, that he held to different views on this, as on some other subjects, at different periods of his life.² It has already been mentioned, in

¹ De Oratione, c. 15.

² So I thought before meeting with Faber's attempt to explain and reconcile this apparently incongruous passage ;—and so I must still think, on the whole, though it must be confessed, that his explanation is ingenious and plausible in a high degree. It is briefly this ; that Origen is here teaching us “that, in two several aspects, prayer is *not* to be offered to Christ. Thus, Christ is not to be prayed to, under the aspect of *That which was born*, or under the aspect of *The incarnate Son's human nature*. And thus, again, Christ is not to be prayed to under the aspect of *Our High Priest or Mediator*. For, in that capacity, his euchenical office is, not to receive our prayers as addressed immediately to himself, but to present them intercessively to the Father.—Yet, as Origen himself in numerous passages elsewhere instructs, this is no reason, why prayer should not be offered to him, as God the Son, inseparably united to the Father.” And precisely this, according to Faber, is the distinction which Origen had in view in a passage quoted above, and which he thus translates. “We shall supplicate also the Word himself, and offer up our intercessions to him, and give thanks to him, and pray to him, *if, respecting prayer, we shall be able to understand dictional propriety and incorrect abuse, τὰν δυνάμεθα κατακόνειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ κατὰ χρήσεως*.” Fab. II. p. 332.

Whether Faber is as accurate an expositor as he is a zealous apologist of this father, I will not pretend to decide ; but it may be proper to bear in mind, as favoring some consistent exposition of him, that his most distinguished successor, Didymus, strenuously contended, that Origen was charged with contradiction, through the misapprehension of his readers.

the notice of his life, that he himself acknowledged such a change, in several respects, in his latter days. Supposing such a change in this case, we naturally ask, whether his views became more or less orthodox, as he advanced in years. Such a query is to be answered from the dates of those works in which these diverse opinions are respectively found. On this point, Guerike¹ adduces proof from Eusebius, in favor of the position, that the treatise on prayer was written before the book against Celsus. Of course, in his maturer years, Origen became more orthodox, as appears from the above extracts from those works. This position may be further confirmed by passages in his homilies, which are also of a later date than his work on prayer. And as they will cast more light on his views, I will subjoin a few of them. In his homilies on Exodus, he thus prays: "Lord Jesus, grant me that I may be counted worthy to have some memorial in thy tabernacle."² So on Leviticus: "It becomes me to invoke my Lord Jesus, that he would make me to find when seeking, and open to me when knocking."³ So on Numbers: "From the heart, we implore the Word of God, who is his only begotten, and who reveals the Father to whom he will, that he would deign to reveal these things also to us."⁴ In commenting on Rom. x, as quoted by Guerike,⁵ he says: "The apostle, in the beginning of the epistle which he writes to the Corinthians, where he says, *with all who invoke the name of the Lord Jesus Christ in every place, both theirs and ours*, pronounces the very God whose name he invokes, to be Jesus Christ. If therefore Enoch and Moses and Aaron and Samuel invoked the Lord, and he heard them, without doubt they invoked the Lord Jesus Christ. And if to invoke the name of the Lord, and to adore God, are one and the same thing, as Christ is invoked, and as we offer prayers to God the Father first of all, so also to the Lord Jesus Christ; and as we present petitions to the Father, so we express thanks to God, so we give thanks to the Savior. For one honor is to be paid to each, that is, to God the Father and Son, as the divine word teaches, when it says, that they should honor the Son as they honor the Father."

It is proper to state, that these latter passages are from a Latin translation, and may therefore be of somewhat less weight in

¹ Guer. II. p. 207.² Hom. XIII. 3.³ Hom. V. 5.⁴ Hom. XXVI. 3.⁵ Guer. II. p. 208.

themselves, than those we derive directly from the Greek of Origen, though still justly regarded as good authority by Guerike and others.

It will probably not be deemed superfluous, to adduce further proof from the writings of Origen, that he regarded Christ as both human and divine.

Those who denied his proper humanity, Origen pronounced heretics ; while, on the other hand, he frequently argues the divinity of the Savior, from the power with which he spread his religion through the world and subdued hostile minds, of all classes, to the obedience of the faith.¹

The two natures of Christ were supposed, by Origen, to be most intimately united. But on the mystery of this union, no man ever spoke with profounder reverence, though he could not wholly check his wonted propensity for speculation. Let us hear him on this point, first in a brief extract from what he says "on the manner and reasons of Christ's incarnation." After some remarks on the incomprehensible glory of Christ's character and works, he exclaims : "In view of such things respecting the nature of the Son of God, we are lost in perfect admiration, that this supreme nature, emptying itself of its majesty, should become man and be conversant among men.—Of all the miracles and wonders concerning him, this totally surpasses the admiration of the human mind, nor can the infirmity of mortal intelligence perceive or understand how such vast power of divine majesty, and the very Wisdom of God by which all things visible and invisible were created, is to be believed as having been encompassed within the man who appeared in Judea ; and that the Wisdom of God was conceived of a woman, and was born an infant, and cried as infants do.—When we behold in him some things so human that they appear not at all to differ from the common frailty of mortals, and some things so divine that they comport with none other but that divine and ineffable nature of Deity, the narrowness of the human intellect stops, and, smitten with the stupor of admiration, it knows not where to turn, or what to hold to. If it would recognize him as God, it sees him a man ; if it would think him a man, it beholds him rising from the dead, with the spoils of death, whose empire he has destroyed. Therefore, with all fear and reverence, should we contemplate the fact, that, in one and the same being, the

¹ Guer. II. p. 237.

reality of each nature is so exhibited, that nothing indecent, or unbecoming, can be perceived in that divine and ineffable being ; nor, on the other hand, are the transactions to be considered as an illusion by empty appearances,"—as some gnostics pretended. But, "to explain these things to human ears," as Origen goes on to say, 'not only far surpasses all our powers, because it surpassed even those of the holy apostles, but it would, perhaps, be too much for any created being of the heavenly host.' He therefore proposes, 'not through temerity, but because the topic required it, to express his *conjectures*, though he would make no affirmation on the subject.'¹ These conjectures we find in good keeping with his notions about the pre-existence of souls. As already stated, he held to the original rectitude, and perfect equality, of all created spirits, as they came from the hand of their Maker. But when they all declined, though in different degrees, from their first and perfect love, and thence received their diverse assignations, in earth and skies, that, which is now the soul of Jesus, was alone found steadfast. As a reward for this integrity, and to effect the purposes of the divine incarnation, (as God could not otherwise become united with flesh,) this soul was received into the most perfect union with the *λόγος*, they completely embracing each other, so as to become, in a sense, *one spirit*, or the *anima* being as it were merged in the *λόγος*. Thus united, and by this indispensable medium, "God was born a man."²

¹ De Princip. II. 6, 1 seq.

² The entire passage, as extant in the translation of Rufinus, will reward the perusal of the inquisitive. "Verum cum pro liberi arbitrii facultate varietas unumquemque ac diversitas habuisset animorum, ut alius ardentiore, alius tenuiore et exiliore erga auctorem suum amore teneretur, illa anima de qua dixit Jesus, *quia nemo auferet a me animam meam*, ab initio creaturæ et deinceps inseparabiliter ei atque indissociabiliter inhaerens, utpote sapientiæ et verbo Dei et veritati ac luci veræ, et tota totum recipiens, atque in ejus lucem splendoremque ipsa cedens, facta est cum ipso principaliter unus spiritus, sicut et apostolus his qui eam imitari deberent, promittit, *quia qui se jungit Domino, unus spiritus est*. Hac ergo substantia animæ inter Deum carnemque mediante (non enim possibile erat Dei naturam corpori sine mediatore misceri) nascitur, ut diximus, Deus homo illa substantia media existente, cui utique contra naturam non erat corpus assumere. Sed neque rursus anima illa, utpote substantia rationabilis, contra naturam habuit capere Deum, in quem, ut superius diximus,

Still he cautions us against "supposing that all the majesty of Christ's divinity is enclosed within the compass of a small body, as though the whole word of God and his wisdom and substantial truth and life, were either separated from the Father, or confined within the brief limits of his body. But our faith should cautiously shun the two extremes, so that we neither believe anything of divinity to be wanting in Christ, nor that there is any division at all of the divine substance, which is everywhere.— Let no one suppose us to affirm, that some part of the deity of the Son of God, is in Christ, and the remaining part somewhere else, or everywhere, which they may think who know not the nature of an incorporeal and invisible substance; for it is impossible to predicate *parts* and *divisions* of what is immaterial.— The Son of God, therefore, wishing to appear among men for the salvation of the human race, and to be conversant with them, assumed, not merely a human body, as some suppose, but also a soul, similar in nature to our souls, but in purpose and virtue, like himself."¹

By means of this human soul as "a medium," it was practicable for the divine nature to become truly and most intimately united with human flesh, while this λόγος still held its unimpaired union with the Father.

Origen considered the union of the two natures in Christ, to be of the most intimate kind; but still they were by no

velut in verbum et sapientiam et veritatem tota jam cesserat. Unde et merito pro eo vel quod tota esset in filio Dei, vel totum in se caperet filium Dei, etiam ipsa cum ea quam assumpserat carne, Dei filius et Dei virtus, Christus et Dei sapientia appellatur; et rursum Dei filius per quem omnia creata sunt, Jesus Christus et filius hominis nominatur. Nam et filius Dei mortuus esse dicitur, pro ea scilicet natura quae mortem utique recipere poterat: et filius hominis appellatur, qui venturus in Dei patris gloria cum sanctis Angelis praedicatur. Et hac de causa per omnem scripturam tam divina natura humanis vocabulis appellatur, quam humana natura divinae nuncupationibus insignibus decoratur. Magis enim de hoc quam de ullo alio dici potest, quod scriptum est quia *erunt ambo in carne una, et jam non sunt duo, sed caro una*. Magis enim verbum Dei cum anima in carne una esse, quam vir cum uxore, putandum est. Sed et unus spiritus esse cum Deo, cui magis convenit, quam huic animae quae se ita Deo per dilectionem junxit, ut cum eo unus spiritus merito dicatur?" De Princip. II. 3.

¹ De Princip. IV. 30 sq.

means so confounded that some things might not be separately predicated of the one or the other. Thus, as appears from the passage just quoted in our note, while he regarded the union so close, that the scriptures apply divine appellations to the human nature, and human appellations to the divine, he nevertheless considered only the human nature as capable of suffering. This we shall see much more fully, in connexion with other matter, in a number of passages, which I propose here to introduce, from his work against Celsus.—It may be proper just to remark, that Celsus puts his objections to Christianity, into the mouth of a Jew. I shall avail myself here of Faber's translation.

"The fictitious Jew, in the work of Celsus," says Origen, "thus addresses Jesus:"

"What need was there, that, while yet an infant, thou shouldst be carried to Egypt, lest thou shouldst be slain? Surely, it was not fitting, that *God* should be alarmed on account of death. But an angel, it seems, came from heaven, commanding thee and thy relations to flee, lest, if caught, ye should die! The great God, then, who sent two angels on account of thee, could not, in that country, preserve thee, *his own proper son!*"—

"But we Christians giving credit to Jesus, when, concerning the Deity who was within him, he said, *I am the way, and the truth and the life*; and when, respecting his human body, he said, *now ye seek to slay me, a man who has spoken the truth to you*; we Christians pronounce him to be a certain compound; and we judge it meet, that he, who had predetermined to sojourn among us as a man, should not unreasonably expose himself to mortal danger. For, since he wished to appear only as a man testified of God, there would have been an inconsistency in any extraordinary aid which might indicate, that, under the appearance of a man, he possessed something more divine; namely, that he was properly the Son of God, even God the Word and the Power and the Wisdom of God, who is called Christ."¹

"God, (he continues in the person of his fictitious Jew to address Jesus,) cannot have such a body as thine."

"But, in answer to this, we say; that, sojourning in life as a man, he assumed, from a female, a body capable of death."²

¹ C. Cels. I. 66. Faber, I. p. 40, 41.

² C. Cels. I. 69. Faber, I. 42.

"His fictitious Jew goes on to object : How could we deem him to be *God*, who performed nothing of the things which he promised ; and who, when we had convicted him, was at length apprehended, after a disgraceful attempt to hide himself, and who was betrayed by the very persons whom he called disciples? Had he been *God*, he could neither have fled nor could he have been led away in bonds."

"To this we reply : That we do not suppose the visible and sensible body of Jesus to be God, nor even indeed his human soul concerning which it is said, *My soul is sorrowful even unto death* ; but, in our opinion, the Word, who is God and the son of the God of all things, spoke, in Jesus, both the saying, *I am the way and the truth and the life*, and the saying, *I am the gate*, and the saying, *I am the living bread that descended from heaven*, and other sayings of a similar nature. Well, therefore, do we censure the Jews for not deeming him to be God, who is by the prophets so often testified of, as being *the great power and God*, according to the God and Father of all things. For we assert, that, in the Mosaic cosmogony, the Father addressed to him the command, *Let there be light*, and *Let there be a firmament*, and whatever other things God commanded to be made. He, moreover, said to him : *Let us make man after our own image and our likeness* ; and the word having received these commands, did all the things which the Father enjoined him.—But we speak thus, not as separating the *son of God* from the man Jesus : for after the economy, the soul and the body of Jesus became most intimately one with the *Word of God*."¹

Again, in his fourth book, Origen says : "We proceed to notice the next objection, started with abundance of parade, by our antagonist. *God*, says Celsus, is good and excellent and happy. But, if he descends to men, he of necessity experiences a change : that is to say, a change from good to bad, from excellent to base, from happiness to unhappiness. Yet who would choose such a mutation? It may be consistent with the nature of a mortal ; but with that of an immortal, it is wholly inconsistent. *God*, therefore, can never have experienced any such mutation."

"To this it would afford a sufficient reply, if I were to show the character of what, in scripture, is called a descent of God TO MEN : in which there is no need to admit any change in

¹ C. Cels. II. 9. p. 178. Faber, I. p. 42, 43.

him, (as Celsus imagines us to assert,) nor any conversion from good to bad, or from excellent to base. But that which descended to men, was in the form of *God*: and, on account of his philanthropy, he emptied himself, in order that he might be apprehended by them; yet without a change from good to bad, or from happiness to unhappiness. If, however, the *Immortal God the Word*, assuming a mortal body and a human soul, seems to Celsus to be changed and metamorphosed, let him learn, that **THE WORD, REMAINING THE WORD IN SUBSTANCE, suffers nothing of the matters which the body and the soul suffer.**"¹

Again, in book third, Origen says: "On the whole, since he objects to us, I know not how often, concerning Jesus, that *from a mortal body we esteem him to be God*, and that in so doing we conceive ourselves to act piously: it were superfluous, so much having already been said, to give him any further answer. Yet let these objectors know, that this person, whom, with full persuasion, we believe to be from the beginning, *God and the Son of God*, is the very Word and the very Wisdom and the very Truth: and we assert, that his mortal body and the human soul in him, not only by fellowship, but likewise by absolute union and commixture, having participated of his divinity, have passed into the *Deity*."²

As to this 'union and mixture of the natures of Christ,' it is obvious, from what has before been quoted, that Origen is either inconsistent with himself, or that he had some notion of the natures as being thus mixed, and yet not *confounded*. The latter is doubtless the true supposition. It is well known, that a long controversy arose on this mixing of the divine and human natures; which was started, perhaps, by what Origen here says on the topic.

Though he held to this exceedingly intimate union of the two natures, yet he did not consider them united in such a sense, that one could not suffer without involving the suffering of the other. If any further proof can be needed, on this point, it is found in the following passage, which will also lead us on to another kindred topic, the *atonement*.

Speaking of the Word, he says: "We are to conceive dif-

¹ C. Cels. IV. 14, p. 466. Faber, I. p. 45, 46.

² C. Cels. III. Faber, I. 47.

ferently of him, and of his essence, from what we do of the man Jesus. Hence, not even the most simple and unspeculating Christians would say, that the Truth, the Life, the Way, the Living Bread that came down from heaven, the Resurrection, died. No one of us is so stupid as to say, *the Life died, the Resurrection died*. For what else is this, but for the **GREAT GOD to die!** All transactions, therefore, respecting Jesus in his divine nature, were holy and consonant with our conceptions of **DIVINITY**. But as he was man, while blessed beyond other men with communications from the original source of knowledge and wisdom, and himself wise and perfect, he suffered whatever was requisite for one to suffer in doing all things for the whole race of man, or even of rational beings."¹

From this last passage, we see that Origen considered the sufferings of Christ as requisite for the salvation of men, and perhaps of other beings also.

Before passing, however, to further evidence of his views on the subject of Christ's *expiatory death*, it may be proper just to repeat a sensible remark of his, on the reason for the divine arrangement with regard to the public manner of his death. "Had he died in private, instead of publicly expiring on the cross, some might have suspected the same of him as of Orpheus, Protesilaus, Hercules, and Theseus, viz. that he only withdrew himself a while from public view, and then appeared again with the false pretence of having returned from the world of departed spirits. The great facts of his real death and resurrection, would not have been so triumphantly substantiated."²

His views of the **ATONEMENT**, which were somewhat peculiar, now claim our more special notice.

Immediately after the passage quoted above, in which Origen says, that Christ suffered *only as man*, he adds: "And it is not at all out of place, that the man should even die, and that his death should not only stand forth as an example for dying in the cause of piety, but that it should also effect the commencement and the continuance of destruction to evil and to the devil, who had possession of the whole world."³ Elsewhere, he says: "As respects our creation, therefore, we belong to God. We have, however, become the slaves of the devil, as we are sold by our

¹ C. Cels. VII. 16, 17.

² ib. II. 56.

³ ib. VII. 17.

sins. But Christ has come and *redeemed* us, when in bondage to that master to whom we sold ourselves by sinning. And thus he seems, as it were, indeed to have recovered his own whom he had created; and to have acquired, as it were, such as did not belong to him, since they had come under another master by desertion or sin. And indeed Christ is perhaps rightly said to have redeemed us, who gave his blood as our ransom."¹

Again: "He gave his soul as the price of redemption. But to whom did he give his soul as the price of redemption for many? for it was not to God. Was it then to the evil one? for he had us in his power, until the soul of Jesus was given him as the price of redemption, he being deceived, as though he could rule over it, and not considering that it would be impossible for him to endure the torments of retaining this soul. We are therefore purchased by the precious blood of Jesus. The *soul* of the Son of God, was given as the price of redemption for us, but not his spirit, for that he had before committed to the Father;—nor the body, for we find nothing of this kind said of him in the scriptures. And since his *soul* was given as the price of redemption for many, but did not remain with him to whom it had been given as the price of redemption, therefore he says, Ps. xv, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.*"²

Christ had also a further object to accomplish, as Origen supposes, by "his descent into hell," or the place of departed spirits, viz. that he might preach the gospel there and bring "those under the earth," like those on the earth and in heaven, to bow their knee to him.³

But while Origen supposed the price of redemption paid to Satan, in the giving of Christ's *human soul* to him for a time, he also considered Christ as having offered himself a spotless victim to God, in the sacrifice of his *body and blood*, to reconcile God to us.⁴

In Christ's becoming an expiatory victim for guilty men, Origen finds nothing unreasonable, or even new; though the reasonableness is not obvious to the multitude. Thus he writes, while treating of the danger of death, incurred by preaching new doctrine: "Did not the apostles of Jesus perceive this danger

¹ Hom. VI. 9. in Exod.

² In Mat. Vol. III. 725.

³ See proofs in Guer. II. p. 257.

⁴ ib. p. 256.

when they boldly undertook to show, not only to the Jews that he was the person foretold in their prophetic writings, but also to other nations, that he who had just been crucified, had voluntarily suffered this death for the human race, like such as have died to deliver their country from pestilence, famine, or tempest? For it seems fitting in the nature of things, for certain recondite reasons, which are not easily comprehended by the multitude, that the voluntary death of one just person for the community, should propitiate those evil spirits which inflict pestilence, famine, tempest, or any thing of the kind. Let those, therefore, who will not believe in Christ's dying on the cross for men, say, whether they do not admit many stories, among both Greeks and barbarians, of persons who died for the community, that they might purge the cities and nations from invading evils? Or did these things indeed take place, while he, who is regarded as man, is not at all to be credited as having died to destroy the great demon and prince of demons, who had subjected to his power all the souls of men who have come upon the earth?"¹

It has already been shown, that Origen supposed all created spirits to have departed, more or less, from their primitive rectitude; and, as a punishment for such departure, to have had their various allotments on earth, in the heavenly bodies, etc. according to the degrees of their depravity. Christ's human soul alone retained its integrity. Now, as a counterpart of this theory, he also supposed Christ to have suffered for *all* of these, angels and devils as well as men, *that he might gather together, in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth.* But to obtain salvation through Christ, faith and good works were deemed needful.²

Before leaving the writings of Origen, on this subject, it may not be improper to introduce two or three passages more, which have excited much interest and given occasion to much discussion.—If any apology be needed for dwelling so long on what he has left us, I might plead the intrinsic importance of these writings, and the still greater importance, in respect to the history of the doctrine of the Trinity, which has been given to them, in all controversies on the question, since his day. Probably more has been written respecting the opinions of Origen on the Trinity, than respecting the opinions of *all* the other ante-nicene fathers.

¹ C. Cels. I. 31

² See Guer. II. p. 258 sq.

The first passage, which I shall here add, has justly been deemed of great importance in fixing the sense in which the early fathers understood *God the Father* as being "THE ONLY TRUE GOD." Priestley and others have contended, that it was in an *exclusive sense*, so as to leave no room for attributing any proper divinity to Christ or to the Holy Ghost. The passage is, also, a literary curiosity, as it contains a lucid criticism, by an ancient and learned Greek father, on the import of the Greek article; and hence it may be well to give it entire, subjoining the original in the margin.¹

"God, when written with the article, imports him who is *God of himself*. Wherefore also our Savior, in his prayer to the Father, says, *That they may know thee, THE ONLY TRUE GOD*. But every thing, that, beside *him who is God of himself*, becomes God by a participation of his divinity, is not God written with the article, but may more properly be called *God* as written without the article. Wherefore, he who was born before all creation, inasmuch as he was first in regard to his being with God, having from God's divinity derived divinity to himself, is more honorable than those others who beside him are styled gods, of whom God is the God; as it is said, *The Lord, the God of gods, hath spoken*."²

It is forcibly urged, that this passage, instead of denying the real divinity of Christ, asserts it; and that, too, in connexion with the same sort of speculation about *eternal generation*, as that which has been quite current down to the present time. I adduce it, not at all for the purpose of showing how the Greek article is used in scripture, but to exhibit more clearly the historic fact respecting the early mode of speaking and thinking on the divine nature of Christ, as connected with the Father who was considered as "the fountain of divinity." Whether the conceptions of Origen and the early fathers, were like our own, on this

¹ Αὐτόθεος ὁ Θεός ἐστι· Διόπερ καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ φησὶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἐυχῇ· "Ἰνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν. Πᾶν δὲ τὸ, παρὰ τὸ Αὐτόθεος, μετοχῇ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος θεοποιούμενον, οὐχ ὁ Θεός, ἀλλὰ Θεὸς κυριώτατον ἂν λεγοίτο. Ὡς πάντως ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ἅτε πρῶτος τῷ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εἶναι, σπάσας τῆς θεότητος εἰς ἑαυτὸν, ἔτι τιμιώτερος τοῖς λοιποῖς παρ' αὐτὸν θεοῖς, ὧν ὁ Θεὸς Θεός ἐστι· κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον· Θεὸς Θεῶν Κύριος ἐλάλησε. Comm. in Johan. T. II. Opp. Vol. II. p. 46, 47.

² Faber, II. 262, 263.

subject, or whether they were warranted by scripture, it is not to my purpose now to discuss.—I may just remark, here, that some of the other fathers do in fact use the article before Θεός, as applied to Christ; so that we are not to consider the critical distinction thus made by Origen, as universally adopted and observed in practice. Even himself did not always observe it, since he styles Christ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν Πῶν, in his sixth book against Celsus.

I subjoin a passage which Priestley adduced in favor of his position, that Origen was in doubt whether the Spirit was not made by Christ. I give it as translated by Professor Burton, in a late work, and quoted, with one alteration, by Faber.

"We, however," says Origen, "are persuaded, that there are three *hypostases*, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and believing that nothing is unproduced beside the Father, adopt this as the more pious and the true opinion; that, all things being made by the Word, the Holy Ghost is more honorable than all of them, and more so in rank than all the things which were made by the Father through Christ. And perhaps this is the reason why he is not also called the very Son of God, the Only Begotten being the Son by nature from the beginning, who seems to have been needful to the Holy Ghost, ministering to his *hypostasis*, not only that he might exist, but also that he might be wise and rational and just and whatever else it be right for us to suppose him to be, according to his participation in those qualities which we have before mentioned as belonging to Christ."¹

While this passage has been urged, by anti-trinitarians, in proof against the orthodoxy of Origen, it has also occasioned much trouble to those who have undertaken to vindicate the consistent and steady orthodoxy of the great catechist. Even Dr Burton, in demolishing Priestley's construction, seems not a little troubled with the import of his own translation of the paragraph. "Such," says the learned professor, "as quoted by Faber,") "*is this extraordinary, and, I must add, unfortunate, passage of Origen.*" Faber, however, relieves the passage of what was more especially *unfortunate* in the case, viz. a mistranslation of the phrase, διακονοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, which Faber renders, "ministering to his hypostasis;" but which Dr. Burton had translated, "to have assisted in *forming* his hypostasis;" thus leaving at least an air of plausibility to Priestley's no-

¹ Comm. in John, T. II. Opp. Vol. II. p. 56. Fab. I. p. 58.

tion of the passage, as to Christ's making the Holy Spirit. Faber, with his more literal rendering, takes away this aspect from the declaration, and leaves Origen to be naturally enough understood, as only speaking of the ancient doctrine of the *emanation* or *procession* of the Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father. And such Faber supposes to be the real design of Origen.

The following passage is particularly valuable for the light it casts on the faith of the less learned among the Christians, in Origen's day, in respect to the deity of Christ. "But also with those who, (whether through great seclusion from knowledge, or through simplicity, or through want of those who should exhort them to rational piety,) do not indeed clearly perceive these things, but who believe in the supreme God and his only begotten Son the Word and God, there may be found a more noble sanctity and purity and ingenuousness of deportment."¹ What a testimony do we also here find to the moral worth then to be met with in the ordinary walks of christian life, as well as to the creed then prevalent even among the illiterate part of the church. The simple belief in one Almighty God and a Divine Savior, could render them thus superior in moral dignity, to the very best and most enlightened among the heathen. Such is the import of the passage, in its connexion.

We now proceed to the opinions of other catechists.

Dionysius appears to have speculated much in the manner of his predecessors on the subject of the Trinity; and to have said some things for which Athanasius and other fathers have blamed him. According to Eusebius, he engaged, with great zeal, in opposing the doctrine of Sabellius, as being "full of impiety and blasphemy against Almighty God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and full of unbelief concerning his only-begotten Son, the first begotten of every creature, the Word, which dwelt among men, and full of stupidity against the Holy Ghost."²

He also opposed Paul of Samosata, who is considered as the first *humanitarian* of any note. *Dionysius* thus rebukes him, in a letter: "How say you, that Christ is merely an eminent man, and that he is not the true God, who is to be worshipped above the whole creation conjointly with the Father and the Holy Ghost; him, I mean, who became incarnate from Mary the holy virgin and mother of God.—Though he humbled himself to death, even the death of the cross, yet with God he is equal."³

¹ C. Cels. VII. 49. p. 362.

² Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VII. 6.

³ Dionys. Ep. adv. Paul. Sam. Opp. pp. 210, 211. Fab. II. 71.

Like Origen, he regarded the Father as the fountain of light, and the Son as the effulgence; but both as equally eternal. "Life," says he, "is begotten of life, as the stream flows from the fountain." The following is a specimen of his mode of reasoning and illustration, respecting the connexion between the Father and the Son. Speaking of the mind of man as exhibiting itself in language, he says: "The mind produces the word and appears in it, and the word exhibits the mind, in which it is produced. And the mind indeed is, as it were, the *word immanent*; while the word is the *mind coming forth*. The mind passes into the word, and the word transmits the mind, to the auditors; and thus the mind, through the word, takes its seat in the minds of the auditors, entering at the same time with the word. And the self-existent mind is, as it were, the father of the word; and the word, the son of the mind; nor can the word be produced before the mind or without it, but exists with it and takes its germ and origin from it. In the same manner, also, the Supreme Father and Universal Mind has, before all things, a Son, the Word, the Speech and Angel of his own self."¹ Again he says: "They bring it as an accusation against me, that I do not assert Christ to be of the same substance with God (*ὁμοούσιον*). Now, although I allege, that I have no where found or read this word in scripture, yet other arguments, which I have subjoined and on which they are silent, are not at all discordant with this sentiment. For I adduced human offspring as an example, which certainly is of the same race as the progenitor; and I said truly, that parents are distinguished from their children solely by this, that they are not themselves the children.—I said that a plant, whether springing from the seed or the root, is different from that from which it springs, but yet completely of the same nature."² Again he says: "I spoke of the Father; and before I made mention of the Son, I included him in the Father. I annexed the Son; and the Father, if I had not even named him before, would certainly have been comprehended in the Son. I added the Holy Spirit; but at the same time implied from whence and by whom he proceeded.—Each of the names is brought forward by me in turn, nor can they be separated or divided.—Neither can the Holy Ghost be sundered from him who sends, nor from him who brings him." "We thus both expand

¹ De sent. Dionysii, c. 23. as quoted by Guerike, II. p. 317 sq.

² ib. c. 18.

the indivisible unity into the trinity, *τὴν τριάδα*, and again conclude the undiminished trinity in unity."¹

Thus we see this early Platonizing father vindicating himself from the charge of heresy on the subject of the trinity. Some of his predecessors appear to have found a like vindication needful in their case. Now, may I not here be permitted briefly to inquire for the fair inference from this obvious fact? As it belongs no less to historic, than to theological, investigation, the query is strictly in place; and is simply this: Since these men were complained of for *defect* of faith respecting the *trinity in unity*, but *never*, in their own day, for too strict a conformity to what has since been deemed orthodoxy, is it not manifest, that the church at large were then more orthodox than these philosophers? And if so, how is it possible that they should have been the *inventors* of this orthodoxy? This is a point which appears to me of prime importance, in the investigation of the early opinions of the church; and which has not had the prominence it deserves, if indeed it has ever been distinctly presented. The general belief of the church, is never changed in a day; and when prominent men are met by opposition *only in one direction*, does it not amount to demonstration, that the novelties, which these men may be introducing, are to be found in this direction? With this simple statement of the query, which has before been partially suggested, I dismiss it.

Theognostus, according to Athanasius, held that "the substance of the Son was not created out of nothing, but was by nature from the essence of the Father, as the splendor of light and the vapor of water; for neither is splendor the sun itself, nor is vapor water itself; nor yet are they any thing extraneous. But the emanation of the Father's essence, is still such, that the same essence of the Father suffers no division. For as the sun remains the same without diminution by the efflux of its rays, so neither does the substance of the Father suffer any diminution, while emitting the Son as the image of himself."²

Peter Martyr, is reported, by Ephraim of Antioch, to have testified that "it is according to sound thinking and to the preaching of the fathers, to hold to the union of the two natures and to one person," in Christ.³

¹ De Sent. Dionysii, c. 17.

² Athan. Opp. I. p. 420.

³ Guer. II. p. 328.

In respect to *Arius*, the readers of this work are already too familiar with the opinions of this heresiarch to require any statement of them, in such a sketch as the one before us. We therefore pass to the last teacher of any note.

The post-Nicene father *Didymus*, in his books on the Trinity, has much to say on the sameness of essence in the Father and the Son. Some quotations, while they exhibit his views on the subject in question, will also serve to mark the spirit of the age.

"The Son," he remarks, "is said to receive the same from the Father by which he himself subsists; for the Son is nothing else but what is given him of the Father, nor is there any other substance of the Holy Spirit besides what is given it by the Son."¹ Again: "Those who believe on the Son, need not fear being accused of giving honor and glory to created gods." And further on, he says: "The heretics ask, Whether God, in begetting, acted according to his will, or against it? But we ought first to know their purpose in this question, before we answer it. Their design, then, is this, to derive an objection against the simple, from either answer. For if you answer, that he begat against his will, (though no one answers them so,) they say, that God is impelled by a natural necessity, in begetting a son, when he does not wish it. But if you reply to them, that God begat voluntarily; then they infer, that the generation of the Son, which gives him existence by creation, is dependent on the will of the Father. But this answer is perfectly gratuitous; for God, both the Father who begat and the Son the splendor of his glory, is antecedent to will and constraint and all thought, and no medium can be conceived of between him and the Father from whom he exists. Such is the image of God.—This is also an empty and absurd sophism of theirs, expressed in language like the following. If the unbegotten God is wholly *generative*, γεννητικός, then he who is begotten, is not generated as to substance, since the whole substance of the former possesses the quality of generating, but not of being generated. But let them hear the answer. If all *light* is generative, then it does not generate *splendor substantially*, but *this* it acquires *from abroad*, since all its essence has the power to generate, but not to be generated. But if light does not receive splendor from abroad, but directly produces it from its whole essence, neither does God have his Son added to him from abroad, but has directly produced him, as to the entire

¹ De Sp. Sancto, T. II. p. 519. Guer. II. p. 337.

substance, as incorporeal; whence it is, that he is really a father.—If light unchanged produces splendor, *ἀναύγασμα*, itself still remaining light, and having splendor connaturally perfected from itself; then God also remains immutably God, although he be the father of his own splendor, since he has not received it from abroad, but generated it in substance perfect.”¹

This ancient father, like others before him, was led to the above comparison, by what Paul says respecting Christ as *the effulgence of the Father's glory*.

After some further remarks, in which he speaks of the imperfect illustration of which such a subject is capable, he proceeds thus: “The Son was begotten from eternity; yet existing and operating at the same time with his Father, just as light with the disk of the sun; but this he has, that he both is, and in scripture is called, God, Lord, The Holy, Creator, The Incorruptible, Life, Light, and whatever else the Father is. And from the great multitude [of such comparisons], he ought rather to hold similitude and equality, than dissimilitude from one [comparison of a different kind].—But how are Adam and Eve, who were *not begotten*, nor had any father, equal in nature to us who have descended from them? Or what kind of comparison or measure is that to which they refer him who is, as they say, *anomalous*, *ἀνόματος*, while they insist upon it, that they may pronounce a father to be the greater and more excellent of the two? since, on the one hand, scripture neither admits a distinction of natures in the one individual holy and eternal Trinity, nor does it pronounce the one prior and the other posterior; and, on the other hand, these two things are manifest, viz. first, it plainly does not follow, that what is greater, is of a different essence, *ἐτεροουσία*, since comparisons are made between things of the *same*, and not of *different*, essences;” etc.²

The doctrine of *Christ's omniscience*, is argued, by this father, with much ingenuity. The following is a specimen of his argument on this subject, touching that declaration in Mark XIII. 32, which has often been supposed to imply that Christ is not strictly omniscient: “Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only.” “Matthew,” says Didymus, “relating, before Mark, the same things in different language, and omitting nothing, does not say, indeed, that the Son was ignorant, but he shows

¹ Did. de Trin. I. 7, 9, 10.

² ib. 16.

that even the very manner of the consummation of the world, was known to the Son.¹ But how is it, that *he* should not see, *who has light in himself*, who arranged the order of all things, who knows all things before they take place, and who has said, that the last day shall come as a thief in the night?—who has even foretold the signs of that time?—and who has said : *Like as the Father hath known me, even so have I known him?* Now it is evident, that he knows with the same knowledge which the Father has. But if it is one thing, *to know the Father*, and another thing, *to know the things* of the Father, it will be greater to know the Father, than to know the things which belong to him, to wit, *the last day.*”

“But this passage, *No one knoweth that day or hour, neither the Son, but the Father*, may be thus taken, as one of the holy fathers, (Basil by name,) full of wisdom, has simply taught ; i. e. it is the same as if Christ were to say : Unless the Father had known, neither would the Son have known ; from which it follows, that, if the Father knows, I cannot be ignorant. But I do not declare it, he says, for I do all things according to the Father’s will ; and it is not the Father’s will, that ye should know this. *To you*, therefore, says he, I am ignorant ; although of the thing itself, I am not ignorant ; for I have declared to you before, by the Psalmist, *Far from my salvation, are the words of my offences*, i. e. *far from my deity are the words I speak in the flesh.* So also did he conduct himself in respect to Lazarus. For before, as knowing all, he said : *Lazarus sleepeth* ; but afterwards, as though he knew nothing, he asked : *Where have ye laid him?* And, at length, as God, he raised him from the dead. So, likewise, respecting the woman with the issue of blood ; for before, as a man ignorant, he said : *Who touched me?* and then as the Savior, he healed her.”²

Whatever may be thought as to the accuracy of this father’s interpretations of scripture, the above passages will leave no doubt as to the tenor of his creed on the character of Christ.

It would be easy to multiply passages to show his views of the propriety of offering prayers to Christ, etc. and likewise that he believed in the divinity of the Holy Ghost ; and, in short, that he accorded fully with the Nicene fathers. But we need the room for other matter ; and shall therefore proceed to another topic.

¹ See Matt. xxiv. 36 sq.

² Didym. de Trin. III. 22 sq.

ART. II.—THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN LIFE
IN CONNEXION WITH THE CHURCH, AS DEVELOPED AMONG
HEATHEN CHRISTIANS.

From Neander's "History of the Planting and Progress of the Christian Church under the Apostles." Translated from the German, by the Editor.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

The following article contains a profound discussion of the questions respecting the constitution and features of the primitive church, so far as these can be ascertained from the New Testament, or from other contemporary sources. The reader must, however, everywhere bear in mind, that the author is here treating *only* of the apostolic age, and of the churches composed of Gentile Christians. Consequently he does not refer to changes introduced at later periods. These of course are detailed in his larger History of the Christian Church. This latter work, we are happy to learn, is now in the course of translation by the Rev. Prof. Torrey, of the University of Vermont; to whom the public may look with entire confidence for a correct and elegant version. See Bibl. Repos. Vol. III. p. 66—74.

One word in regard to the manner in which the present translation has been executed. There are two methods in which a translator may proceed. One is, to give simply the sense of the original in the translator's own language and style; in this way the reader obtains the thoughts of the original author, but gains no acquaintance with his style and manner as a writer. The other mode is to translate the language of the original, as well as express the thoughts; so that the writer himself, in his peculiar modes of thought and expression, may be placed before the reader. In lighter works, the former method may be sufficient; in more important ones, the latter is alone admissible. Indeed, so much often depends on the shaping of the thought and the colouring of the expression, that justice cannot be done to a writer in any other way; nor even in this way without peculiar qualifications in the translator. In the following pages I have endeavoured to give to the style the general character and features of that of the author; I hope it will not be found to have lost in perspicuity. My aim has been to give to each thought the exact shape of the original, and also so far as possible the same form of expression; and everywhere accurately to express the meaning, the whole meaning, and nothing but the meaning, of the author.—Ed.

THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The forms in which the constitution of the christian community first unfolded itself, were, as we have already remarked, copied in a great degree from those forms of religious association, which existed among the Jews. But these forms, as first applied and perfected among Jewish Christians, would not have passed over in like manner to communities gathered independently among the heathen; they would not here also have propagated themselves thus extensively; had they not been so entirely accordant with the very nature of that christian fellowship, which was to receive from them its organic manifestation. It was through the PECULIAR NATURE of this christian fellowship, that the christian church was to be distinguished from all other religious communities; and this became indeed, after Christianity had burst the forms of Judaism, particularly prominent among the churches of Heathen Christians, which could thus assume a free and independent form.

As Christ had now once for all satisfied that religious necessity from the feeling of which a priesthood had everywhere arisen, in that through the atonement made for man he had satisfied the feeling of the need of mediation between God and man, which is so deeply seated in the consciousness of separation from God through sin,—there remained no longer any place for any farther necessary mediation. When therefore in the apostolic epistles, the Old Testament ideas of a priesthood, of priestly worship, of sacrifices, are applied to the new religious polity, this is done with the single purpose of showing, that since Christ has forever realized that which was the aim of the priesthood and sacrifices under the Old Testament, THE RECONCILIATION OF MEN WITH GOD, so now all who through faith appropriate to themselves that which he thus accomplished for mankind, are brought thereby to stand in the same relation with each other towards God, without the need of any further mediation; that they all, consecrated to God and sanctified through fellowship with Christ, are called to bring to God their whole life as a spiritual thank-offering acceptable to Him; that their whole course of consecrated action, is a true spiritual priestly worship,—and Christians a community of God composed only of priests.¹ This

¹ Rom. 12: 1. 1 Pet. 2: 9.

idea of the universal priesthood of all Christians, springing as it does from the consciousness of an atonement and grounded alone in this, is in part distinctly declared and unfolded; in part it is pre-supposed in the predicates, figures, and comparisons, which are applied to the christian life.

Since all believers mutually shared in the same consciousness of a like common relation to Christ as their Redeemer and of a fellowship with God obtained through him; there was founded also in this circumstance a similar relation of the believers among each other; while at the same time the basis of every other relation was taken away, such as existed under other religious systems between an order of priests and the people at large, of whom they were the guides and for whom they acted as mediators before God. The apostles themselves were far from assuming a relation to the believers, which should have any resemblance to a mediating priesthood; they place themselves uniformly in this respect in a relation of equality with them. When Paul assures the churches of his intercession for them, he also entreats their intercession for himself. Hence then, there could consequently arise in the christian church no such class of persons, like the priests of more ancient systems, who, as the only persons of full age and knowledge in religion, had their secret (esoteric) religious doctrines for themselves, and held the people, as in a state of spiritual non-age, in constant dependence upon themselves; whose office it was, to unfold, to guide, and to govern, the general religious consciousness of the community. Indeed, such a relation would have been inconsistent with the consciousness of a like dependence upon Christ and a like relation to him,—of a like fellowship of life with him. The scenes of the first Pentecost had just shewn, how one and the same consciousness of a higher life, proceeding from fellowship with Christ should fill all hearts; and the same was repeated with every new mutual awakening which preceded and resulted in the founding of a church. The apostle Paul, in the fourth chapter of Galatians, describes as the common point between Judaism and heathenism in this respect, the condition of non-age, of bondage under external ordinances. With the consciousness of atonement, he represents this bondage and non-age as taken away; the same spirit should be in all. Over against the heathen, who blindly followed their priests and were devoted to all the arts of delusion which they practised, he places the Christians, who through faith in the Redeemer are themselves

become the organs of the divine Spirit,¹ who may themselves perceive in the inward man the voice of the living God. Paul thinks he should assume too much, were he, in reference to a church already founded, to represent himself in spiritual things only as a giver; since in this respect there is for all only one giver, the Saviour himself, as the fountain of all life in the church; all others, as members of the spiritual body endued with life from him, the Head, should stand towards each other in the relation of a mutual giving and receiving. Hence, in writing to the Romans,² after expressing his longing to come to them in order to impart to them some spiritual gift for their confirmation, —lest he should seem to ascribe too much to himself, he immediately subjoins the explanatory remark, that he means only, that they might mutually strengthen each other in the faith by christian communion.

Christianity gave indeed, on the one hand, to the church, through the Holy Spirit as the common principle of a higher life, an element of union above all else which can unite souls to each other,—a principle destined to subordinate to itself all those differences which have their ground in the ordinary development of human nature, and in this subordination to adjust them all to an equilibrium. But on the other hand too, through this divine life, which every where followed the law of the natural and ordinary development of human nature, the peculiarities of the inward man were not destroyed; on the contrary, they were purified, sanctified, and ennobled; they were urged forward to a freer and higher culture. This higher unity of life was to be exhibited in a manifold variety of different peculiarities, all animated by the same Spirit and mutually supplying each other's deficiencies in the compound whole of the kingdom of God. Hence the particular aspect, under which this divine life became active and revealed itself in each individual, was conditioned by the inward peculiarities existing in that individual. The apostle Paul indeed affirms: "All these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, who divideth to every one severally *AS HE WILL*;"³ but it by no means thence follows, that Paul supposes a wholly unconditional working of the divine Spirit. He will here only render prominent the contrary of an arbitrary human estimate, which admitted only certain species of divine gifts, and would not acknowledge the manifold variety in the distribution of them.

¹ 1 Cor. 12: 1 sq.² Rom. 1: 11, 12.³ 1 Cor. 12: 11.

The similitude of the members of the human body, which the apostle afterwards employs, describes the not arbitrary, but regular, developement of the new creation in the soul according to the natural though now sanctified order; for it follows from this similitude, that as among the members of the human body each has its appropriate place assigned by nature, each its appropriate office assigned by nature, and each its appropriate capability in reference to these; so also the divine life in man follows in its developement a similar law, founded in the natural relation to each other of the peculiarities which it operates to quicken.

From all this we gather the proper idea of a *Charisma* or gift, so all-important in the history of the first developement of christian life and of the constitution of the christian church in the primitive ages. Under this name, in the apostolic age, is understood any predominant capability of an individual, in and through which the power and efficacy of the Holy Spirit which quickens him, manifests itself; ¹ whether this capability appears as something immediately communicated by the Holy Spirit; or whether it existed already in the individual before his conversion, and now being quickened, sanctified, and elevated through the new principle of life, is consecrated to the one great and common object, the constant internal and external developement of the kingdom of God or of the church of Christ. ² That which is the soul of the whole christian life, and which constitutes the internal unity of this life, that faith which works by love, cannot be regarded as itself a special *Charisma*; for it is this, constituting as it does the very essence of the whole christian disposition, that must control all the individual christian capabilities. Indeed, it

¹ The *φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος*, *manifestation of the Spirit*, peculiar to each individual. 1 Cor. 12: 7.

² The term of most general import, by which, after Paul coined it in this sense, is expressed all that which has reference to the internal requisitions of the divine kingdom, in respect both to the whole and to its parts, is the word *οἰκοδομεῖν*, *to build*; subst. *οἰκοδομή*, *a building*, 1 Cor. 3: 9, 10. This use of the word proceeds from that mode of view, which compares the christian life of the whole church and of its individual members to a building, a temple of God, erected upon the foundation on which this edifice must necessarily rest, 1 Cor. 3: 9, 10, and ever built up progressively and unceasingly more and more from the foundation. So the kingdom of God is to be ever progressively and unceasingly built up. See the striking remarks of Nitzsch in his *Observationes ad Theologiam practicam feliciter excolendam*, Bonn 1831, p. 21.

is first and only from the very circumstance of their being thus governed by this common principle of the christian disposition, that even these individual capabilities become Charismata.¹

That through which Charisma becomes Charisma, that common principle in all, is always itself something above the course of nature, something divine. But yet there occurs a variety in THE EXTERNAL FORMS, in which this higher principle appears and manifests itself, according as they result from the creative or directing energy of the Holy Spirit. On the one hand, they present themselves as the result of the original creative energy of the Holy Spirit, adopting as its own the natural conformation,—they appear as something more immediately and directly produced ; although even here some secret connexion may exist between a peculiar bent in the individual, and this special agency of the divine Spirit in him particularly. Such are those Charismata, to which in the New Testament are ascribed *δυνάμεις, σημεῖα, τέρατα*, miracles, signs, wonders. On the other hand, these forms may be derived from the developement of the ordinary natural conformation under the quickening influence of the Holy Spirit,—from a peculiar cultivation of the peculiar faculties of the individual, which already existed in him before conversion, and are now only quickened anew by the Holy Spirit. The first species of Charisma belongs more to the peculiar efficiency of the Holy Spirit during the apostolic age, to this peculiarly creative epoch of the introduction of Christianity to mankind. The second species belongs to that agency of the Spirit, which has continued down through all the following ages of the church, and by which the nature of man, in its peculiar and essential features, is ever to be more and more pervaded and ennobled. These two forms of Charisma, consequently, in their manifestation in the apostolic church, may properly in one sense be distinguished from each other ; as indeed the gift of producing effects in the sensible world above the ordinary course of things, the gift of *δυνάμεις*, miracles, and the more specific gift of healing the sick by such an agency, the *χάρισμα ἰαμάτων*, gift of healing, are described as special gifts.² But still, these gifts, as special gifts, are only ranked on an equality with the others ; there is no where a distinction of two orders of spiritual gifts, the extraordinary and the ordinary, the supernatural and the natural ; for, according to the view of the apostolic church, in all these

¹ 1 Cor. c. 13.

² 1 Cor. 12: 9, 10.

spiritual gifts as such, the SUPERNATURAL principle, the divine element of christian life, was to be regarded as the essential point.

The Charismata which occur in the apostolic church, may be most naturally divided into such as had a bearing on the advancement of the kingdom of God or the edification of the church through the word, and such as had a bearing on the advancement of the kingdom of God through other kinds of external ministration.¹ In respect to the first species of these Charismata, there arises in them a further distinction, according to the different manner in which the self-agency of the individual, as exerted upon the various powers of the soul and their functions, stands related to the influence of the Holy Spirit; according as, on the one hand, an immediate inspiration in the higher consciousness predominated, while the lower temporal consciousness, which forms the connecting link between the soul and the external world, retired; or as, on the other hand, that which the Holy Spirit imparted, was received in the joint and harmonious exercise of ALL the powers of the soul, and so was developed and wrought into form through the co-operative and intelligent agency of the understanding.² Hence the various degrees in the Charismata, of which we have already spoken in another place; the Charisma of *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, speaking with tongues, of *προφητεύειν*, prophesying, and of *διδασκαλία*, teaching.

Such persons as had been in some measure already prepared, by a previous culture of the receptive and communicative faculties of the understanding, were now able to develop and communicate that which the illumination of the divine Spirit revealed to their higher consciousness, in a connected series of doctrinal instruction. These were the *διδάσκαλοι*, teachers, according to that christian knowledge, *γνώσις*, which they had acquired for themselves through a self-agency quickened by the Holy Spirit, —a self-agency which developed and wrought into form the truths perceived by them through this divine illumination. The prophet, on the contrary, spoke as he was impelled by the might of sudden inspiration at the moment; yielding to a sudden ele-

¹ Comp. 1 Pet. 4: 11.

² We might here apply what Synesius in his *Dion* says respecting the relation of the *βασιλία*, the *αἶμα μακρόν*, and the *θεοφόρητον*, to the formation of the *μύση καὶ ἐπιστατικὴ δύναμις*.

vation of his higher self-consciousness, to a light which here burst in upon him, he spoke according to a revelation, ἀποκάλυψις. The prophet, in respect to his mental peculiarities and culture in general, may probably have been distinguished from the teacher, διδάσκαλος, by the predominancy of feeling and of the power of spiritual intuition over the understanding. Hence the two Charismata did not always require to be separated in different persons. In many moments of inspiration, the teacher might rise into the prophet. In such a state of mind the prophet uttered incidental and powerful addresses for the awakening, exhortation, warning, and consolation of the church; or such addresses to those who had not yet embraced the faith, as might serve to arouse their conscience and so prepare the way in their minds for the instruction of the διδάσκαλος. It is manifest, what an influence this power of inspired discourse, which wrought so especially upon the feelings, must have had at this period for the spread of the Gospel. There came often into the congregations, persons, who only wished once to see what was done in the christian assemblies; or who only wished to become acquainted with the christian doctrine, of the divine character of which they were yet by no means convinced.¹ In these assemblies there now stand forth men, who testify with overwhelming power to the corruption of human nature and the universal need of an atonement; they speak from the depths of their own religious and moral consciousness to that of the other, as if they could read it to the bottom. The heathen feels himself stricken in conscience; his heart is as it were unlocked before him; he must acknowledge, what he before could not believe, that the power of God is with this doctrine, that it dwells among these men.²

If now the connected instruction of the διδάσκαλος, teacher, served to lead on to further knowledge those who had already embraced the faith; or further to uphold in them the intelligent consciousness of that which they had received in the faith; it

¹ The ἄπιστος, unbeliever, in 1 Cor. 14: 24, is one who does not yet believe, but still one who is not unsusceptible towards the faith,—the *infidelis negative*. Such an one therefore may be awakened to the faith through the προφητεία. The ἄπιστος in v. 22, is an obstinate unbeliever, one who is wholly unsusceptible towards the faith. Such an one therefore is also unsusceptible to the influence of the προφητεία,—the *infidelis privative*. For such as these no awakening signs, σημεῖα, can have place; but only such as bring punishment.

² 1 Cor. 14: 25.

was in like manner the province of the *προφητεία*, prophecy, to bring over to the faith, those who were not yet believers; or, in those who were already in the faith, to quicken anew and strengthen their faith, to stir up anew in them the life of faith. In the gift of tongues, *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, on the contrary, the elevated and ecstatic consciousness of God alone predominated, while the consciousness of the world was wholly withdrawn. In this condition, the medium of communication between the deeply moved inward man and the external world, was wholly wanting. What he spoke in this condition, from the strong impulse of his emotions and his inward views, was not a connected discourse, such as the *διδάσκαλος* gave; nor was it an address adapted to the wants and circumstances of others, *παράκλησις*, like that of the prophet; but, without being capable in this condition of regarding the inward circumstances and wants of others, he was wholly occupied with the relation of his own soul to God. The soul was absorbed in devotion and adoration. Hence to this condition are ascribed prayer, songs of praise to God, and the attestation of his mighty deeds.¹ Such an one prayed in spirit; the higher life of the soul and spirit predominated in him; but the power of intelligent developement was wanting.² Hence,

¹ 1 Cor. 14: 14 sq. Acts 2: 11. In so far as from this state of mind there could proceed different kinds of religious manifestation, as *προσεύχεσθαι*, prayer, and *ψάλλειν*, singing, we see the reason of the plural *γλώσσαις*, tongues, and of the expression *γένη γλωσσῶν*, kinds of tongues, etc.—[It may be here remarked, that this view of the gift of tongues is founded chiefly on the expressions of Paul in 1 Cor. c. 14; and is now the more current view among the evangelical theologians of Germany, notwithstanding the very strong passage against it in Acts 2: 4 sq. Compare Olshausen's Commentary, II. p. 584, 585. This passage in Acts is commented upon by Neander in the early part of his work, in a very able and candid, though perhaps not satisfactory, manner.—The first question here is, whether the two passages in Acts and 1 Cor. have reference to two separate and different gifts of tongues; or whether one of the passages is to be explained, and modified by the other. The former is the view of Bretschneider and others. If the latter be adopted, then the question arises, In which passage the more obvious meaning is to be thus explained and modified? Commentators in general have taken the narrative in Acts as the basis; those of Germany hold more to the declarations of Paul.—Ed.]

² Whether we take *πνεῦμα* in 1 Cor. 14: 14, as the personified inspiration itself, or as the *πνευματικόν* in man, the spirit, as a faculty for

when in the midst of his peculiar emotions and spiritual contemplations he formed for himself a peculiar language, he was wanting in the power so to express himself as to be understood by the greater number. Had now the apostle regarded the gift of tongues, the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*, merely as the result of a disordered enthusiasm, and as yielding fruit neither for the christian life of the individual, nor for the furtherance of the christian life in others; however affectionate the manner in which Paul writes to the churches, always acknowledging the good before he censures the evil; still, he would assuredly never have consented to call a failing in the christian life by the name of Charisma; nor would he in that case have been able to say of himself, "I thank my God that I speak with tongues more than ye all."¹ If however we adopt the view here unfolded of this Charisma, it is obvious that he could recognize in this extraordinary ecstatic elevation of mind an operation of the Holy Ghost, a special gift of divine grace; and it then becomes in itself not improbable, that the apostle, who was himself elevated to the highest points of christian life, who could relate of himself so many visions and revelations of the Lord, who heard things which could be expressed in no human language,²—that such an one should often find himself in a state corresponding to the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*. But it was in accordance with that wisdom of the apostle which ever had regard to the wants of ALL those who were in the church, that although he acknowledged the worth of these occasional higher moments of inward life in respect to christian life as a whole, inasmuch as they served to impart to it a loftier flight, yet he preferred to leave the language of such moments to the private devotions of each individual, and to banish them from assemblies for mutual edification. It was too in accordance with the same wisdom, that he placed a higher value upon those spiritual gifts in which the joint and harmonious exercise of all the powers of the soul was more conspicuous, and which in the spirit of love served more for mutual edification; and that he feared the danger of self-delusion and enthusiasm, where the extraordinary phenomena of the christian life were thus overesti-

the reception of the divine influence, we must in any case understand by *νοῦς* i. q. *τὸ νοοῦν*, the power by which to develope in thought that which has been beheld in spirit.

¹ 1 Cor. 14: 18.

² 2 Cor. 12: 1—4, *ὅπτασται καὶ ἀποκαλύψει Κυρίου.*

mated, and when that which could have value only as it proceeds unsought and spontaneously from the developement of the inward life, became an object of effort to many, who in this way could only fall into a state of morbid mental excitement. Hence it was Paul's desire, that he who spake with tongues should in this manner pour out his heart to God in private; but that in the assemblies of the church these expressions of devotion, which the greater number could not understand, should be withheld; or only then allowed, when that which was thus uttered, could be immediately translated into language intelligible to all.

With this stands connected another distinction in these Charismata, according as the creative, or the receptive and critical faculty, was more prominent. Such was the case with this latter faculty in the Charisma of the interpretation of tongues, *ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν*, and that of the distinguishing of spirits, *διάκρισις πνευμάτων*. The christian life was to be allowed in the church to develope and declare itself with freedom. Whoever felt an inward impulse, was permitted to speak in the assemblies of the church; but self-possession was to accompany inspiration side by side; and it was from this very circumstance that the latter was to be known as genuine. No one was to speak alone and exclusively; no one was to interrupt another.¹ If now Paul held it necessary to give such directions, it follows, that he by no means recognized the prophets in the church to be such untroubled *media* or organs of the divine Spirit, as not easily to mingle the divine and human together. Against the prevalence of such an intermixture and the delusions flowing from it, if that which was human and impure were given out as the inspiration of the Holy Spirit,—against this the churches were to be protected by a trying of the spirits, in the exercise of a gift bestowed on individuals for this special purpose.² In the case of the teacher, *διδάσκαλος*, in whom the intelligent exercise of the understanding was more prominent, there was less need that such a gift of trying spirits should accompany his discourse; because in him the critical faculty was developed and active; and because while thus unfolding the christian doctrines with sober self-possession, he could ever give to himself the proper direction. But in the case of the prophet, the less he was able, in the moments of entrancing inspiration, to observe, to scrutinize, and give to himself the proper

¹ 1 Cor. 14: 30, 31, 32.

² 1 Cor. 14: 29. 1 John 4: 1.

direction, the greater there was here the danger of intermixing the divine and the human,—so much the more was it necessary, in order to avoid this, that there should be a scrutiny exercised by others. For this cause, the exercise of the prophetic gift was to be accompanied side by side by the gift conspicuous in particular individuals, of proving the spirits,—a critical faculty of the mind, quickened by the Holy Spirit. This Charisma assuredly did not consist alone, nor chiefly, in deciding who was a prophet and who was not ; but also and principally in the circumstance, that in the discourses of those, who stood forth as inspired speakers in the assemblies of the church, a separation was to be made, according to the prescriptive model (norm) of the divine doctrine, between what was to be regarded as proceeding from the Holy Spirit, and what was to be regarded as not proceeding from him ; just as Paul in this respect recommends to the church, ‘to prove all things’ imparted by the prophets, and admonishes them to separate the good from the bad.¹ And while those who spoke as prophets did not claim to be infallible, but were conscious of their liability to error, and submitted themselves to the judgment of the church or of its organs appointed for that purpose, they were themselves thus shielded from the self-delusions of pride, the ordinary source of fanatical enthusiasm.

Even in the Charisma of teaching, *διδασκαλία*, there seems again to have been also a distinction ; according as the teacher had a greater capacity for unfolding the christian doctrine *theoretically* in its constituent parts, or for applying it *practically* to the particular relations and circumstances of life. The one was the word of knowledge, *λόγος γνώσεως*, the other the word of wisdom, *λόγος σοφίας*.²

If now from the species of gifts which relate to the ministration of the word, we pass to that class of gifts which relate to other kinds of external ministry for the advancement of the kingdom of God, we find here again the same distinction, between those in which, as in the case of the *διδασκαλία*, human agency, developed according to the laws of human nature, operates as quickened by the life-giving influence of the Spirit ; and those

¹ 1 Thess. 5: 21.

² *Σοφία* is more particularly a faculty of practical judgment, corresponding to the idea of *wisdom*. *Γνώσις*, in the New Testament and throughout this whole age, is more particularly the theoretic, higher, deeper, experimental knowledge of religion.

in which the natural developement of the human faculties has less place, while that which is immediately divine is more prominent, as in the case of the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* and *προφητεῦν*. To the former class belong the gift of church government, the *χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως* or *τοῦ προεστάναι*, and the gift of helps, or of the manifold services which were required in administering the affairs of the church, as the superintendence of alms and the care of the sick,—the *χάρισμα διακονίας* or *ἀντιλήψεως*.¹ To the latter class belongs the gift of miracles, and especially that of miraculous cures. The Charisma from which both these latter kinds of operation proceed, understood in reference to its essential nature, seems to be *ἡ πίστις*, faith.² The name faith, *πίστις*, in this connexion, cannot signify christian belief in general, or the common and ordinary disposition of mind in Christians; but it must necessarily here designate something special. And, as would appear from the relation of *ἡ πίστις* to both these kinds of operation, in which there is manifested a special power of the will over nature,—and as is confirmed by the predicate given to *πίστις*,³ “Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains,” that is, could render possible that which is apparently impossible, through the power of religious conviction acting on the will,—the name *πίστις* is here used to signify, the practical power of the will as quickened, elevated, augmented, by christian faith. But notwithstanding this difference in the manifestation of the Charismata, still, he who ministered in the services of the church, had this in common with the worker of miracles, that he was conscious of performing all his duties only through a power imparted to him from God.⁴

Although now, as we have thus seen, by means of these spiritual gifts imparted to individuals according to their various capacities, no one was alone to exercise any partial determining influence upon the church; but all, in the exercise of a mutual influence upon each other, were to work together for one great end, under the controlling influence of one Head, animating and quickening the whole throughout all its manifold members;⁵ still, it by no means follows, that every GUIDANCE of the church by human organs was excluded. It follows only, that these

¹ 1 Cor. 12: 28. Rom. 12: 7.

² 1 Cor. 12: 9. 13: 2. Matt. 17: 20.

³ 1 Cor. 13: 2.

⁴ 1 Pet. 4: 11.

⁵ Eph. 4: 16.

guiding (governing) organs were not to exercise an exclusive authority; that they were not to break loose from their connexion with that lively organization of the whole, which through the free mutual agency and influence of the individual members was to be ever progressive; that they were not to withdraw from their relation to the other members, as like servants of the same Head and of the same body. For this guidance there existed likewise a special talent, quickened by the Holy Ghost,—the gift of government, *χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως*. It was this, which rendered individuals particularly qualified for the station of officers of the church. The name of *presbyters*, by which this office was at first designated, was, as we have before remarked, transferred to the christian church from the Jewish synagogues. But now, when the churches had spread themselves more among the heathen of Grecian origin, there was associated with this appellation, thus borrowed from the civil and religious constitution of the Jews, another name, more connected with the mode of designating social relations among the Greeks, and better adapted to denote the official duties connected with the dignity of presbyters.¹ This was the appellation, *ἐπίσκοποι*, *overseers*, over the whole church and over all its affairs; just as in the Attic civil administration, those who were sent out to organize the states dependent on Athens, were called *ἐπίσκοποι*;² and just as this name seems to have become generally current in the language of civil life, to denote any kind of governing superintendence in the public administration.³ Since now the name *ἐπίσκοπος* was nothing more than an accommodation of the original Jewish and Hellenistic name of office to the social relations existing among the heathen; it follows even from this, that originally both names referred to one and the same office; just as al-

¹ The apostle Peter, in his first epistle, denotes the rank itself by the name of presbyters, *πρεσβύτεροι*; but the duties connected with it he describes by *ἐπισκοπεῖν* i. q. *ποιμαίνειν*. c. 5: 1, 2.

² Elsewhere called *ἀρμοσταί*. Schol. Aristoph. Av. 1023, *Οἱ παρ' Ἀθηναίων εἰς τὰς ὑπηκόους πόλεις ἐπισκέψασθαι τὰ παρ' ἑκάστοις πεμπόμενοι, Ἐπίσκοποι καὶ φύλακες ἐκαλοῦντο, οὓς οἱ Λάκωνες Ἀρμοστάς ἔλεγον*.

³ Cic. ad Att. VII. 11. "Vult me Pompejus esse, quem tota haec campana et maritima ora habent *ἐπίσκοπον*, ad quem delectus et summa negotii referatur." Fragm. of Arcadius Charisius *de Muneribus civilibus*: "Episcopi, qui praesunt pani et caeteris venalibus rebus, quae civitatum populis ad quotidianum victum usui sunt." Digest. lib. IV. tit. IV. leg. 18. § 7.

so both appellations are often used interchangeably, as being entirely synonymous. Thus Paul addresses, as ἐπίσκοποι, the elders collectively of the Ephesian church, whom he had sent for to come to him.¹ In like manner also the office of presbyters is called by Paul ἐπισκοπή;² and immediately afterwards the office of the deacons, διάκονοι, is mentioned as the only other office existing in the church. So too where Paul commissions Titus to appoint presbyters, he again immediately calls them bishops, ἐπίσκοποι.³

It is consequently certain, that each church was governed by a union of church elders or of church overseers out of its own midst; and we find among these no distinction whatever of any individual, who presided perhaps as a *primus inter pares*; a custom probably first introduced in the age following that of the apostles, (out of which, alas! we have so few authentic documents,) when such a person received by preference the distinguishing name of an ἐπίσκοπος. We have no account whatever, what the practice was in the apostolic age, in respect to the person presiding in the deliberations of the presbyters. But whether it was, that one person presided in their deliberations according to some certain turn or order of succession; or that the relation of age was followed; or that by degrees some one particularly distinguished by his personal qualifications for administering office, obtained this precedence,—all of which we must leave undecided for want of information,—still, it remains thus far certain, that such a person who presided in this manner, was not yet distinguished by any separate name.

The government of the church was the appropriate charge of these officers of the church. It was their business to watch over the general order; to maintain the purity both of the christian doctrine and of christian life; to prevent abuses; to set right the erring; to take the lead in the general deliberations;—all which appears from those passages of the New Testament in which their

¹ Acts 27: 17, 28. Should any one feel entitled to assume, that not only the officers of the Ephesian church are here meant, but also those from other churches in Asia Minor; he might say indeed, that under these ἐπίσκοποι we are to understand only the presiding officers among the elders. But the other Pauline passages speak against such a distinction; and Luke at least, who refers this address only to the officers of the Ephesian church, consequently regarded the names ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος as wholly synonymous.

² 1 Tim. 3: 1, 8. So too in Phil. 1: 1.

³ Tit. 1: 5—7.

duties are described. But their government by no means excluded the participation of the whole church in the management of the common concerns; as follows indeed from what we have said above respecting the nature of the christian fellowship; and as is also apparent from many examples in the apostolic church. The whole church at Jerusalem took part in the consultations respecting the relation of Jewish and heathen Christians to each other; and the letter which was drawn up after these consultations, was in like manner written in the name of the whole church.¹ Those epistles of Paul which treat respecting matters of controversy in the churches, are addressed in each case to the whole church; and he presupposes, that the decision in regard to these matters belongs to the whole church. In the contrary case, he would have directed his counsels and precepts at least chiefly to the officers of the church. When a vicious person is to be excluded from the church at Corinth, the apostle regards it as something which must proceed from the whole body; and he therefore translates himself in spirit into their midst, in order with them to pronounce and execute judgment.² Where also he speaks of the adjustment of private controversies, the apostle does not say expressly, that this was to be the business of the officers of the church. Had this, according to prevailing usage, belonged to the office of the elders, Paul would doubtless have alluded to the fact. But what he says on this point, seems much more to presuppose, that for particular cases it was customary to appoint umpires from the body of the church.³

In regard to the edification of the church through the *word*, it follows from what we have already said, that this was not the exclusive business of the officers of the church; for each person had the right to speak out openly, in the assembly of the brethren, the emotions of his soul. Hence many did not sufficiently distinguish, between what strictly belonged only to the closet, where one could pour out his heart freely before God, and what was appropriate for communication in public. This was what Paul censured.⁴ The female part of the church alone

¹ Acts 15: 12, 22, 23. ² 1 Cor. 5: 3, 4, 5. ³ 1 Cor. 6: 4, 5.

⁴ See what is said above on the gift of tongues.—It has indeed been affirmed, that this right extended itself in the apostolic church, only to those who stood forth as prophets in the church assemblies; and that from this one instance we cannot infer such a general privilege; for

was excluded from this general privilege. The *one* higher fellowship of life, indeed, which was imparted through Christianity, extended itself also to the relation between man and wife, male and female ; and that oneness after which human nature according to its original destination ever strives, was in this respect also, as in every other, realized in and through Christianity. But yet, since whatever was founded in the law of nature, Christianity nowhere destroyed, but on the contrary quickened anew, sanctified, and ennobled it ; so also within this fellowship of a higher life, which was thus to bind the sexes to each other, a place was assigned to the woman corresponding to the natural destination of her sex. The exercise of the receptive faculties, and occupation in the duties of family life, are recognized as appropriately the destination of the female ; and hence the female sex was excluded from speaking in public upon religious topics in the assemblies of the church.¹

these persons, as teachers furnished with divine authority, and speaking in the name of God, were naturally for this very reason not bound by the common rules. See Mosheim Institut. Hist. Ecc. Major. Sec. I. § 10, 18. But this objection is removed by what we have said above respecting the prophetic Charisma and its relation to the other Charismata.

¹ 1 Cor. 14: 34. 1 Tim. 2: 12. With this prohibition the passage in 1 Cor. 11: 5, seems indeed to stand in contradiction. Even in earlier times the Montanists supposed, and many moderns have accorded with them, that an exception was here made ; either as if the apostle supposed those cases could be subjected to no rule, where the *immediate* influence of the divine Spirit excited prophetesses from among the female sex ; or, as if he would exclude the woman only from the strictly *didactic* kinds of speaking, but not from the public expression of feelings and emotions. But there exists here, in the first supposition the error, that too great a distinction is made between teaching, *διδάσκειν*, which also proceeds from the influence of the Holy Spirit, and prophesying, *προφητεύειν*, in relation to what is divine in both. It is also an error, to regard any agency of the Holy Spirit in the christian church as not subject to rule. If the apostle Paul assigns to the woman that place in the church, which is assigned to her by the spirit of the gospel which sanctifies nature ; the Holy Ghost assuredly, which is itself the Spirit of Christianity, also follows everywhere in his operations the same law ; and it can never be assumed with certainty, that by an exception he has anywhere removed the woman out of her natural position. Every removal of this kind must appear as something contradictory to the spirit of the gospel, and as something mor-

Still, just as through the participation of all in the management of church affairs, a regular government of the church by its appointed organs was not excluded, but both were to act together; so too, along with what the members of the churches in consequence of a common christian inspiration contributed to mutual edification, there was to be a regular administration of the office of teaching in the church, and a regular supervision over the propagation and developement of the christian doctrine, which in this period of agitation and ferment was exposed to so many adulterations. This was the object of the above-mentioned Charisma of teaching, *διδασκαλία*. There were three classes of such teachers in the apostolic age. The first rank was held by those who had been personally selected and consecrated by Christ himself; who by intercourse with him were prepared as organs for the annunciation of the gospel to the whole human race; who were the witnesses of what he himself had spoken, of his works, of his suffering, of his resurrection. These were the apostles;¹ to whose number Paul also was justly reckoned, on account of the personal appearance of Christ to him, and the illumination of his spirit independently of the instruction of the other apostles. The other classes were the travelling missiona-

bid. Further, in the passage where Paul gives this prohibition in respect to females, he is expressly treating of those *non-didactic* kinds of discourse. These can therefore form no exception; which is contrary to both suppositions. We must therefore rather seek to solve the apparent contradiction in this way, viz. that Paul in 1 Cor. 11: 5 is speaking merely by way of example in respect to what actually took place in the Corinthian church; reserving his censure for another place. One of the grounds adduced by Paul in 1 Tim. 2: 12 sq. viz. the greater danger of self-delusion in the weaker sex, and the consequent diffusion of error,—would apply more directly to that species of discourse, in which sober self-possession was most of all withdrawn. But under other circumstances, where no danger of that kind could arise from publicity, this species of religious self-utterance would doubtless seem the most appropriate to the female sex; only that the exercise of it should always be confined to the domestic circle. Thus the daughters of the evangelist Philip at Cæsarea, Acts 21: 9, could speak as prophetesses without detriment to the rule; unless we prefer to assume that something took place here also, which Paul would have censured.

¹ In a wider sense this name was also applied to others who preached the gospel in wider fields of labour.

ries, *εὐαγγελισται*,¹ evangelists; and the teachers, *διδάσκαλοι*, in the individual churches, appointed from their own midst.

If sometimes *προφῆται*, prophets, are named immediately after apostles, and before the evangelists and teachers, they are here to be regarded* as such persons in whom that condition of inward life from which prophesying, *προφητεῦν*, proceeded, had become in a measure more constant; who were distinguished above the teachers by a greater energy and constancy of christian inspiration, and by a peculiar originality of spiritual vision, imparted to them by special *ἀποκαλύψεις*, revelations, of the Holy Spirit. Such prophets belonged, as appears from their being placed between the apostles and evangelists, to that class of teachers whose charge was not limited to a particular church; but who travelled about in order to proclaim the gospel to a wider circle.

In respect to the relation of the teachers, *διδάσκαλοι*, to the presiding officers of the church, the elders or overseers, *πρεσβύτεροι* or *ἐπίσκοποι*, it will not do to proceed at once on the hypothesis, that this remained always the same, after the first founding of the christian churches among the heathen, and consequently throughout the whole period of Paul's apostolic labours—a period so important in the first developement of the christian church. We are therefore not entitled to conclude,

¹ This name assuredly does not come from the circumstance, that these persons perhaps occupied themselves with collecting and relating the narratives of the life of Christ; for the name *εὐαγγέλιον*, *evangelium*, *gospel*, originally signified nothing more nor less than the whole annunciation of the salvation bestowed by Christ on mankind; which annunciation embraces the whole of Christianity. But as this annunciation rests on an historical basis, and Christ as the Redeemer is the grand object of it; there arose at a later period the derived meaning, in which this word is specially applied to the historical narratives of the Saviour's life. According to the original christian idiom, therefore, the word *εὐαγγελιστής*, evangelist, could only designate one whose charge it was, to proclaim the doctrine of salvation to men, and thereby lay the foundation for christian churches; while, on the contrary, the *διδάσκαλος*, teacher, presupposes already a belief in this doctrine, and a church already established, and occupies himself with further unfolding and inculcating christian knowledge. This view is supported by the use of the word *εὐαγγελιστής* in 2 Tim. 4: 5; and this primitive christian idiom continued to prevail also in later times, although the other later meaning of the word *εὐαγγέλιον* was then connected with it. See Euseb. Hist. Ecc. III. c. 37.

from certain traces which occur in the later epistles of Paul, that the relation which might be inferred from them, had so existed from the first in the churches of heathen Christians. If we find, in earlier documents, much that stands in contradiction with such an hypothesis, we must at least admit the possibility, that changes in the situation of the churches, and the results of experience, might have already occasioned a change in this respect in that earliest period.

The first question therefore is: What was here the original relation? If we set out from the supposition which may be supported from the pastoral epistles, that the teachers, *διδάσκαλοι*, belonged also to the presiding officers of the church, we can conceive of two cases: either, that all the presbyters or bishops also exercised at the same time the office of teachers; or, that some among them, each according to his peculiar qualifications, his *χάρισμα*, were occupied with the external guidance of the church, the *κυβέρνησις*, while others were devoted to the inward guidance of the church through the word, the *διδασκαλία*; hence therefore *πρεσβύτεροι κυβερνωῦντες* i. q. *ποιμένες*, and *πρεσβύτεροι διδάσκοντες* i. q. *διδάσκαλοι*.¹ The first case can assuredly not be admitted; for the gift of government, *χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως*, is just as definitely distinguished from the gift of teaching, *χάρισμα διδασκαλίας*, as in reality the faculty of governing, and the faculty of teaching, are distinct and different from each other. And according to the original arrangement, the particular office was always to correspond to the particular Charisma. Further, since in the later periods of the Pauline age, those presbyters are particularly commended who were at the same time qualified for the ministry of teaching, it is clear that this was not originally presupposed in all. But as to the second case, likewise, we have no sufficient ground to assume it as the original arrangement. Since the Charisma of presiding or governing, *τοῦ προϊστάσθαι* or *τοῦ κυβερνᾶν*, is, in the first epistle to the Corinthians and that to the Romans,² so expressly distinguished from the talent for teaching; and since the two first designations, *προϊστάσθαι* and *κυβερνᾶν*, fully describe that which from the first belonged to the office of presbyters or bishops, and the object for which the same was originally in-

¹ Comp. Eph. 4: 11. 1 Tim. 5: 7. Tit. 1: 9.

² 1 Cor. 12: 28 sq. Rom. 12: 6 sq.

stinted; we have no good reason whatever to conclude, that the teachers, *διδάσκαλοι*, belonged also to the officers of the church.

In the epistle to the Ephesians,¹ indeed, which was written at a later period, the *ποιμένες*, pastors, and *διδάσκαλοι*, teachers, are in so far placed together, and only so far, as they are both distinguished from such as occupied a more general field of labour. But the name *ποιμένες* signifies expressly the governing officers of the church, the presbyters or bishops; and therefore it does not at all follow from this passage that the *διδάσκαλοι*, teachers, also belonged among them. In other respects, the name *ποιμένες* might likewise well have been applied to the *διδάσκαλοι*; since the name in itself and in accordance with the manner in which the figure of a shepherd is employed in the Old Testament and by Christ, was also appropriate to express the guidance of souls through the ministry of teaching. Further, Paul² also ranks the *διδασχὴ*, teaching, among those kinds of public discourse, which were not connected with any particular charge or office; but which every person in the church who had an inward call and capacity, was entitled to hold.

It could also happen, that after the body of presbyters had already been appointed in a church, there might come forward in it, either from its midst or by the accession of new members, other persons who, in consequence of their former culture, were particularly distinguished for their gift of teaching, even more perhaps than the presbyters themselves; and this would speedily become apparent from their discourses in the church assemblies. How in this period of early and free developement of ecclesiastical life, could the gift bestowed on such persons have been left unemployed, because they did not belong to the number of the presbyters? It would seem, that there were individual members of the churches, in whose dwellings portions of the churches were accustomed to convene; and it was probably not merely the local convenience of their houses which gave occasion to this, but also their gift of teaching, by which the brethren wished to profit. So in the case of Aquila; who, though sojourning now at Rome, now at Corinth, and now at Ephesus, wherever he was, was always wont to have a small private meeting of church members in his house, *ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ*.³

¹ Eph. 4: 11. ² 1 Cor. 14: 26. ³ Rom. 16: 5. 1 Cor. 16: 19.

Thus then the office of ruling in the church originally had nothing in common with the ministry of teaching. Although the overseers of the church watched not only over the whole life of the church, but also over that which was regarded as its foundation, the maintenance of pure doctrine and the avoidance of erroneous teaching; and although consequently, from the very first, such persons must have been chosen to this office as had attained to a greater ripeness and firmness in their christian belief; still it by no means follows, that they must themselves have possessed the gift of teaching and have occupied themselves with public discourses. It may be, that at first the *διδασκαλία*, teaching, was in general not connected with any particular office; but that those who were qualified, were accustomed to stand forth as teachers, *διδάσκαλοι*, in the church assemblies; until it followed of itself, that these persons so particularly furnished with the Charisma of teaching, of whom there could naturally be in most churches only a few, became the regular teachers of the churches. In the epistle to the Galatians,¹ indeed, Paul might seem to hint, that there were already teachers appointed by the church, who were also to receive from it their temporal support. But it may be questioned, whether the apostle is not here speaking of the *εὐαγγελισταί*, travelling evangelists, rather than of *διδάσκαλοι*, teachers; and the passage seems also to refer not so much to a regular support, as to the voluntary aids of christian love, through which the momentary necessities of these missionaries were to be relieved. But in any case—as this very passage also serves to confirm, if we must understand it of *διδάσκαλοι*—these latter were and continued to be wholly distinct from the presiding officers of the church.

It was at a later period, when the oppositions of false doctrine, among which the further spread of the pure doctrine of the apostles had now to maintain itself, threatened great and unceasing dangers—as was particularly the case in the later years of Paul's labours—it was then first that this apostle held it necessary, to connect the offices of church teacher and church ruler more closely together; and to provide, that such overseers of the church should be appointed, as were at the same time capable, through their public discourses, of preserving the church from the danger of infection from false teachers, and capable also of confirming others in the pure doctrine of the gospel, and of confuting its opposers.² He therefore holds those presbyters, who

¹ Gal. 6 & 6.² 1 Tim. c. 1.

laboured also in the ministry of teaching, to be worthy of peculiar consideration.¹

We remarked above, that the female sex alone were excluded from the right of public speaking in the assemblies of the churches. Yet still, the peculiar gifts imparted to females could be employed for the external service of the church, in many species of charitable aid, in which the ministry of females was particularly appropriate. And further, in the then existing relation of the sexes towards each other, the deacon, *διάκονος*, in the performance of many of his church duties, might easily awaken suspicion in reference to the female part of the church; such suspicion, however, it was necessary for the new religious sect to guard against in every possible way; since even without this, there was a tendency to believe every evil report respecting it, just because it was new and stood forth in contradiction to the existing state of things. Hence, corresponding to the office of deacon, arose the office of the deaconess, *ὁ καὶ ἡ διάκονος*. The office first arose, perhaps, in the churches of heathen Christians. In respect to the origin and nature of it during the apostolic age, we have no definite accounts; since we find certain mention of it only in one passage of the New Testament.² In later times, indeed, what Paul says³ of those widows who received their support from the church, has been applied to the deaconesses. And many of the qualities which he requires in those who might be received into the number of widows,⁴ and which seem to include a reference to particular duties, as hospitality to strangers and the care of the poor, might be supposed to countenance such an interpretation. But since Paul describes them only as supported by the church, without mentioning any active office which they were to exercise in the church; since he describes them as in consequence of their situation and age withdrawn from attending to earthly affairs, and consecrating the few remaining days of their life to prayer and devotion; and since, on the other hand, the office of the deaconess must have brought with it much external occupation and business; we have therefore no good ground to understand this passage of deaconesses, nor even of women from whose number deacon-

¹ 1 Tim. 5: 17, 19.

² Rom. 16: 1.

³ 1 Tim. 5: 3—16.

⁴ 1 Tim. 5: 10.

esses were to be chosen.¹ What Paul says too of the deaconess of the church at Cenchrea,² seems by no means to harmonize with what he writes to Timothy, respecting the age and indigent condition of the widows. We must rather, therefore, under these widows, understand such women, who, after having as christian wives and mothers exhibited an example of the conscientious discharge of duty, were now in their forsaken state to find a place of rest and honour in the bosom of the church, as their only refuge; and so, by a life of spiritual devotion, to set a bright example for the edification of other females; perhaps too, from the store of their christian experience collected in the course of a long life, to give counsel to those of their own sex who might seek it of them, and create at the same time upon the heathen an impression of respect and veneration. Hence it must naturally have been a matter of reproach, when such an one lightly returned again from the seclusion of a still devotional life, into her former relations.—In any case, we find here a church arrangement of the later apostolic age; to which period also other parts of the same epistle seem to allude.

In respect to the consecration of church officers, it consisted in laying the hand upon the head of the person to be consecrated—a symbol borrowed from the Jews, the Jewish *קידוש*—accompanied by an invocation, that the Lord would impart to such person that which this symbol implied, the gifts of his Spirit for the due execution of the office now committed in his name to the candidate. And since, under the presupposition that the proper coincidence existed between what was thus done externally and what ought to coexist with it in the inward bent of the soul, no one doubted that the significancy of the whole transaction thus performed in the name of Christ, would go into accomplishment in the person to whom it was applied; so, in this respect, the communication of the spiritual gifts requisite for the execution of such offices, was supposed to be connected with this external consecration. And as Paul thus presupposes the connexion of the internal and the external, and therefore desig-

¹ The supposition that from v. 9 onward, the apostle is speaking of another class of widows, different from those intended in v. 3—8, seems to me wholly untenable. A comparison of v. 16 with v. 4 and v. 8, shews clearly that the whole passage refers to the same subjects.

² Rom. 16: 1. 1 Tim. 1. c.

nates the whole of this sacred transaction by that alone which was its external symbol, without distinguishing its separate elements, he consequently exhorts Timothy to seek to quicken anew in himself that gift of the Spirit, which he had received by the laying on of hands.¹

In respect further to the *choice* of the various officers of the church, it is clear, that the first deacons and the delegates sent as the representatives of the churches to accompany an apostle,² were chosen from and by the churches themselves. From these examples we might infer, that a similar mode of proceeding was also followed in the appointment of the presbyters. From the fact that Paul, in committing to his pupils, as to Timothy and Titus, the organization of new churches or of those which had fallen into many distractions, committed to them also the appointment of the presbyters and deacons, and directed their attention to the qualifications requisite for such offices,—from this fact we are by no means entitled to infer, that they themselves effected this alone, without the participation of the churches. Much more, indeed, does the manner in which Paul is elsewhere wont to address himself to the whole church and to claim the co-operation of the whole, authorize us to expect, that at least where there existed a church already established, he would have required their co-operation also in these matters of common concern. But the supposition is certainly possible, that the apostle in many cases, and especially in forming a new church, might think it best himself to propose to the church the persons best qualified for its officers; and such a nomination must naturally have had very great weight. In the example of the family of Stephanus at Corinth,³ we see the members of the household first converted in a city, becoming also the first to fill the offices of the church.

It was likewise only among the churches of the heathen Christians, that the peculiar nature of christian devotion could at first enstamp itself completely upon the character of public worship. Among the Jewish Christians, the ancient forms of the Jewish worship continued to maintain themselves; although among these latter also, those who were truly penetrated by the spirit of the gospel, and who therefore had appropriated to themselves the essence of that spiritual homage which is bound to no place and to no time, were thereby freed from the contracting influ-

¹ 2 Tim. 1: 6.² 2 Cor. 8: 19.³ 1 Cor. 16: 15.

ence of these forms upon the inward life, and were thus able to give to these forms a higher significancy by referring them to the spirit of the gospel. On the other hand, among the heathen Christians, the essence of a free spiritual worship developed itself in direct opposition against Judaism, and against the attempts to mingle Judaism and Christianity together. According to the doctrine of the apostle Paul, the Mosaic law IN ITS WHOLE EXTENT had lost its validity for Christians as such; nothing therefore could be an authoritative rule for Christians, merely because it was contained in the law of Moses; but, whatever was to be binding as a law for the christian life, must as such be derived from some other source.¹

According to this view, the idea is excluded of a transfer of the Old Testament commandment in respect to the sanctification of the Jewish sabbath, to the position of Christianity. Whoever thus made himself dependent on any single commandment, would in this very way, according to Paul's mode of thinking, have made himself again subject to the yoke of the whole law; he would have brought his inward life again into bondage to external earthly things; and sinking again into the theocratic particularity of Judaism, he would have denied the theocratic universality of the gospel; for, on the gospel ground, the WHOLE of life was to be referred in one and the same manner to God, and was to serve for his glory;—there was to be here no longer any opposition or distinction between what belonged only to the world and what belonged to God. Thus also every day and all the days of the Christian's life were to be in like manner holy to the Lord. Hence Paul says to the Christians of Galatia, who had been misled to acknowledge the Mosaic law as obligatory, and to observe the Jewish festivals:² 'But now, after that ye have known God, or rather through his compassionate love have been brought to know him, how turn ye again³ to the weak and wretched things of the world, so as to wish again to be in bondage to them?' He fears that his labour among them, to convert them to Christianity, has been in

¹ The further developement of this view is contained in the section on doctrine.

² Gal. 4:9.

³ Thus he speaks to those who were formerly heathen; for although in other respects he places Judaism in opposition to heathenism, yet he regards as a common feature of both, the adherence to external forms.

vain ; and this because they regarded as essential to religion, the observance of certain days as alone holy.¹ The apostle does not here contrast christian festivals with Jewish ; but he regards this whole tendency to refer religion to *certain days* by way of preference, as something foreign to the loftier stand of christian freedom, and as belonging to the position of Judaism and heathenism. In a similar polemic respect, also, he expresses himself to the Colossians,² against those who regarded the observance of certain festivals as necessary to religion, and who condemned those who did not observe them. And although he recommends to the Romans³ forbearance towards those in whom the christian spirit had not yet unfolded itself into true freedom ; he nevertheless assuredly regarded this as the true christian principle, viz. To esteem every day alike ; to regard no day as PECULIARLY holy to the Lord.⁴

It is worthy of remark, that in such passages Paul utterly rejects the observance of every kind of festival, such as was regarded among the Jews and heathen as in itself essential to religion ; and that at the same time he makes no mention of any similar days which were to be consecrated in a manner conformable to Christianity, and not with such a religious bondage,—CHRISTIAN festivals in an appropriate sense. Thus remote was Paul from the thought, that from the position of Christianity there could be any days, which could in any way be compared with what was in the Jewish sense a festival ; that from this position there could be any day which was to be necessarily observed, as peculiarly consecrated to religious life. From such passages it might be inferred, that in the churches of heathen Christians all the days of the week still bore the same relation to religious life, and that every distinction of the one above another in this respect, was accounted as something foreign to the spirit of Christianity.

Accordingly, no wholly certain and definite mention of the religious celebration of the first day of the week among the heathen Christians, is found during the lifetime of the Apostle

¹ Gal. 4: 10, 11.

² Col. 2: 16.

³ Rom. 14: 1, 5 sq.

⁴ The *ὅς δὲ κρίνει πάντας ἡμέραν* v. 5, equivalent to the *ὅ μὴ φρονεῖ τὴν ἡμέραν, κυρίως οὐ φρονεῖ*, v. 6.—[More in accordance with the scope of the author's reasoning, and less liable to misapprehension, would be the converse form of the above proposition, viz. "To esteem every day alike, to regard every day as ALIKE holy to the Lord."—ED.]

Paul; but there are two passages which might render the existence of such a custom probable.¹

If Paul's direction to the Corinthians² on the subject of collections, be understood as referring to collections to be taken up in the church assemblies; it would be clear from this passage, that the first day of the week was at that time especially devoted to such assemblies. But, strictly taken, Paul here only says, that on the first day of the week every one should lay up at home, *κατ' ἐαυτῶν*, whatever he could spare. This now may be so understood, that every one should bring with him to the assembly the sum thus laid up, in order that the individual contributions might be at once brought together, and so Paul find the collection ready on his arrival. But then all this must be first mentally supplied; for which the connexion of the passage gives no necessary occasion.³ And the whole may well be thus understood; that on the first day of the week every one should lay by whatever he could spare, in order that when Paul came, each might have in readiness his contribution made up of the sums thus laid by; and then the individual contributions being brought together, the collection of the whole church might be completed at once; so that it might already be regarded as good as made. If this sense of the passage be adopted, it would not follow that special meetings of the churches were held on the first day of the week, and collections taken up in them. If then we could take it for granted, that independently of the influence of Christianity, and before this could have existed, the Jewish mode of reckoning by weeks had been introduced among the heathen of the Roman empire; we should be able to find in the passage in question no proof whatever of any religious distinction of the first day of the week. But since we are probably not authorized to adopt such an hypothesis,⁴ we certainly have here cause to infer, that it was the RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY which occasioned it to be reckoned as the first day of the week.

¹ [It will be recollected, that the passage in Rev. 1:10, was written after Paul's death.—Ed.]

² 1 Cor. 16:2.

³ On the contrary, the word *συναπλῆναι* 1 Cor. 16:2, is against it, and seems rather to imply the treasuring up by the individual himself of the small sums weekly laid by.

⁴ See Ideler's 'Chronologie,' Vol. I. p. 180.

It is also mentioned in the book of Acts, that the church at Troas had assembled on Sunday and celebrated the Lord's supper. But the question may be asked, Whether Paul deferred his departure from Troas till the next day, because he wished to keep the Sunday with the church; or whether this assembly, which otherwise would have been held on some other day, was held then, because Paul had fixed his departure for the following day.

But in any case we must not derive the origin of the religious distinction of the first day of the week from the Jewish churches, but from the peculiar character of the churches among the heathen Christians; and we may consider the course to have been as follows. When the circumstances of the churches did not allow of their assembling daily for devotion and to hold the *agape* or love-feasts, it became necessary,—although they might find in the nature of Christianity itself no necessity for such a distinction, and although as viewed from the position of Christianity, all days were to be regarded as alike holy and alike consecrated to the Lord,—yet on these special external grounds it became necessary to accede to such a distinction of some peculiar day, for the purposes of religious communion and worship. The Sabbath, which was celebrated by the Jewish churches, they did not select, both in order to avoid the danger of mingling what was Jewish and what was Christian together, which might in that case have so easily occurred; and also because another relation lay nearer to their christian consciousness. Since the sufferings and resurrection of Christ constituted for them the central point for the whole of christian consciousness and of christian life; since they regarded his resurrection as the foundation of all christian joy and christian hope; it was natural to give to the day with which the remembrance of the resurrection of Christ was thus associated, a special distinction for the purposes of religious communion.*

* [It is no part of the Editor's intention to subjoin notes controverting the opinions of the author. These must stand or fall upon their own merits. But as the author wrote for another community, where the great current of national moral feeling, and also of theological opinion, flows in some respects in a different channel from our own, it is quite possible that expressions which there could not fail to be properly estimated, might here be subject to misconception. On this ground I have already added occasionally a remark; and the author's

If however a distinction was thus made in respect to one of the days of the week in the churches of the heathen Christians, it is still a matter of great doubt whether any yearly festival existed among them. In one passage of Paul,¹ indeed, many have thought they found an allusion to a christian passover, to be celebrated with a consciousness of its christian significancy, and with christian feelings; but we are able to find in the passage only an allusion to the Jewish passover, in the celebration of which the Jewish Christians still united. As Paul wrote those words, the image of the Jews and Jewish Christians was before his soul, who on the fourteenth day of Nisan searched carefully through every corner of their houses, in order that no particle of leaven might be suffered to remain. This now in a spiritual

positions in regard to the Lord's day—seem to demand also a similar caution. If we look carefully at the scope of the author's reasoning on this point, it will be seen to be directed exclusively against the idea of a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, as a positive institution, to Christianity,—against that 'theocratic particularity' of Judaism, which connected all religious duties towards God with particular days, and left the remaining days of the week wholly to the world. In opposition to this, the 'theocratic universality' of the gospel elevates the whole of christian life to a state of constant devotion to God; 'whether we eat or drink or whatever we do,' it is all a serving of God; and thus EVERY DAY becomes a Sabbath,—the whole of the Christian's life is a LORD'S DAY. And when the first day of the week came to be observed as a day of rest from labour and of social religious worship and communion with God, it became so not from any special transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, but on other and higher grounds, viz. its being associated with the 'remembrance of the resurrection of Christ, the central point of christian life, the foundation of all christian joy and christian hope.' Such seem to be the views of the author; and in these there is certainly nothing to detract from the dignity and authority of the Lord's day as celebrated by Christians; but, on the contrary, much that gives to it an elevation and sacred significancy far beyond that of any merely positive institution; especially when we consider that the observance of it was introduced and sanctioned by apostolic teachers, who are acknowledged to have acted in things relating to the church and to christian practice, under the influence of an inspiration from on high.—For the general views of Christians in Germany and other parts of the European continent, respecting the Lord's day, the reader is referred to the *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. I. p. 443 sq.—Ed.

¹ 1 Cor. 5: 7.

sense, opposed to the merely external bent of Judaism, he applies to Christians: 'Purge out therefore the old leaven, the leaven of your former nature, that which still cleaves to you of former corruption—in order that ye may be a new mass, representing the renewed and sanctified nature of man,—even as ye are indeed unleavened, i. e. purified through Christ from the leaven of sin,'—just as Paul elsewhere also places the cleansing from sin, the being dead to sin, in connexion with the death of Christ.¹ 'For Christ indeed has offered himself as our passover;' on which true paschal lamb, through whose sacrifice they were truly set free from sin, which could not be effected through the Jewish passover, they were ever to think. 'Let us therefore, as being cleansed from sin through Christ our paschal lamb, celebrate the passover, not in the manner of the Jews, who put away leaven out of their houses while they retain the leaven of former corruption in their souls; but so that in purity of mind we may yield a mass truly cleansed from the leaven of sin.' In all this there is manifestly no reference whatever to a celebration of a christian passover existing among the heathen Christians; but simply the contrast between the keeping of a spiritual passover embracing the whole life of the redeemed, and the merely external Jewish passover.²

In respect to the celebration of the two symbols of christian fellowship, baptism and the Lord's supper, the appointment of Christ himself was to be maintained and transmitted without

¹ This is doubtless the simplest acceptation of the words καθώς ἐστε ἄζυμοι, even as ye are unleavened,—even as redeemed ye are purified once for all from the leaven of sin, ζύμη τῆς ἀμαρτίας. If however any one chooses, with Grotius, to understand the words after the analogy of the Greek ἄσπιτος, ἄσπιτος, in the sense: 'even as ye eat no leaven,' and make this equivalent to: 'even as ye celebrate the festival of unleavened bread or passover,' the passage could still have reference only to a passover spiritually understood. Otherwise, it would not accord with what is afterwards adduced as motive and ground; and it would then also follow, that the heathen Christians had likewise abstained from leavened bread during Easter, which Paul certainly according to his principles could not have permitted.

² If these words are to be referred to a celebration of the passover existing among heathen Christians, it would follow that they likewise kept this festival at the same time with the Jews. In that case the rise of the later difference and controversy in respect to the time of keeping Easter, would admit of no explanation.

change ; and the peculiar shaping of the christian life in connexion with the church among the heathen Christians, could not extend its transforming influence to them. We therefore recur in this respect to what has been already said above. In baptism the essential point was the entrance into fellowship with Christ, along with which consequently was included the being incorporated into Christ's spiritual body,—the being received into the fellowship of the redeemed, into the church of Christ.¹ Baptism, therefore, in accordance with its characteristic feature, was to be a baptism into Christ, into the name of Christ ; and it can well be, that originally in the formula of baptism this alone was made prominent. The mode of immersion in baptism, which was practised among the Jews, passed over consequently to the heathen Christians also. This form was doubtless best adapted to express that which Christ intended to express by this symbol,—the merging of the whole man into a new spirit and life. Paul however takes occasion to employ also what was accidental in the form of the symbol,—the twofold action of submersion and emersion, to which Christ in the institution of the symbol assuredly had no regard. As Paul found in this an allusion both to Christ as dead and to Christ as risen, to both the negative and positive aspect of the christian life,—in following Christ a dying to all ungodliness, and in fellowship with him a rising again to a new and divine life,—he therefore made use here of what was accidental in the received form of baptism, in order thus allegorically to illustrate the idea and the object of baptism, in its connexion with the whole substance of Christianity.²

As now baptism signified an entrance into fellowship with Christ, it readily followed from the nature of the case, that a profession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer should be made by the candidate at the time ; and in the latter part of the apostolic age, there are traces which point to the existence of such a custom.³

¹ Gal. 3: 27: 1 Cor. 12: 13.

² What relates to the more detailed developement of the dogmatic view, is reserved for the section on doctrine.

³ Not such, it is true, as are wholly and beyond all controversy certain. The most express is 1 Pet. 3: 21 ; where however the interpretation may be made matter of question. If it be understood thus: 'Question (*ἐπερώτημα*) as to a good conscience towards God through the resurrection of Christ,' we might infer it to mean a question pro-

Since baptism was thus immediately connected with a conscious and voluntary accession to the christian fellowship, and faith and baptism were always united, it is highly probable that baptism took place only in those cases where both could meet together, and that the custom of infant baptism was not practised in this age. From the examples of the baptism of whole families, we can by no means infer the existence of infant baptism. One passage¹ shews the incorrectness of such an inference; for it thence appears, that the whole family of Stephanus, who all received baptism from Paul, was composed of adult members. Not only would the lateness of the time when the first distinct mention of infant baptism occurs, and the long continued oppo-

posed to a candidate at baptism, in order to ascertain, whether he believed in the resurrection of Jesus as the pledge of the forgiveness of his sins, and whether therefore in this faith he could think on God with a good conscience. But against such a view of the passage, Winer could justly object, that in this case, not the question, but the answer of the candidate must have been mentioned, as expressing his profession, his faith, which indeed was strictly the essential and saving feature. Still Winer's explanation, resting on a different sense of *ἐπερωτά*, viz. 'the inquiry, longing, of a good conscience after God,' does not seem to be the most natural, although according to the Hellenistic idiom *ἐπερωτᾷ τις* can have this meaning; as the passage cited by Winer shews, 2 Sam. 11: 7. Gramm. § 30. 2, n. p. 159. Had Peter wished to say this, would he not rather have used the form *ἐπερωτοῖς*? And may it not also be said against this latter view, that the apostle, according to the analogy of the biblical mode of development, would naturally make prominent as the saving qualification in baptism, not so much the longing after God, as the finding of God through Christ, the attaining to communion with him?—After all, what Peter intends here strictly to designate, is only the spiritual character of the whole baptismal transaction, in opposition to a merely external corporeal purification. This spiritual character could well be designated by the question proposed at baptism, which pointed to the spiritual and religious object of the whole rite; and this question could properly be made prominent instead of the answer, as being first in order, as that which preceded and called forth the answer. In this way the first view of the passage may be justified.—The second trace of such a profession of faith at baptism, is found in 1 Tim. 6: 12. But it is not entirely clear, that the apostle is there speaking of a profession of this kind. He may refer perhaps to a profession which Timothy, from the impulse of his feelings, had made at the time of his consecration as the companion of Paul in the work of preaching the gospel.

¹ 1 Cor. 16: 15.

sition which was made to it, lead us to infer its non-apostolic origin;* but it is also in itself not probable, that Paul, who was so urgent in making faith alone the foundation and fundamental condition of everything christian, and who opposed himself so emphatically to every kind of *opus operatum*—that Paul should have introduced or permitted a custom, which might so easily have been the occasion of transferring to the rite of baptism the illusion of a justification through external things, *σαρρικά*, against which, in its application to circumcision, the same apostle had ever so vehemently contended. The reasoning of Paul to the Corinthians¹ seems also to imply, that the children of Christians were not yet incorporated into the church by baptism; but at the same time, this passage speaks of a sanctifying influence from the intercourse and fellowship existing between parents and children; through which influence the children of christian parents are distinguished from the children of parents not Christian, and in consequence of which they may in a certain sense be termed *ἅγια*, holy, in distinction from the *ἀνάθρακτα*, unholy, profane.² Here now we find the *IDEA*, out of which infant baptism must and did afterwards develope itself, and through which it is to be justified in the spirit of Paul; although on the grounds above

* [The candour of the author leads him in another place to admit, that “in the absence of historical documents out of the first half of this period, [i. e. out of the two first centuries,] the absence of any distinct mention of infant baptism cannot testify against the antiquity of the practice.” See Neander’s *Gesch. der chr. Relig. u. Kirche*, Bd. I. Abth. II. p. 549. The first distinct allusion to infant baptism is by Irenæus in the second century, who approves it; Tertullian, in the latter part of the third century, seems to have been the earliest writer who opposed it, yet without affirming or denying its antiquity.—ED.]

¹ 1 Cor. 7: 14.

² The immediate impressions which result from the whole intercourse of life, and which in consequence of the natural feeling of the dependence of children on parents, pass over from the latter to the former, exert a still deeper influence than the effects of instruction; and these impressions can begin, before there is a capacity to receive such instruction as is to be appropriated with consciousness. These impressions connect themselves with the first germs of unfolding consciousness; and for this very reason, the first beginning of this sanctifying influence cannot, as to time, be specified. See the striking remarks of De Wette, *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken*, Vol. III. p. 671.

mentioned, it is not probable that he himself, under THE RELATIONS in which he stood, actually introduced the custom.¹

In regard to the celebration of the eucharist or Lord's supper, this remained, as in the first churches among the Jews and in accordance with its original institution, connected with a common repast, in which all took part as members of one family. Of the abuses which arose in it, from the intermixture of an ancient Greek custom with the christian celebration, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter, in detailing the history of the Corinthian church.

The gospel, in its annunciation among the heathen, found indeed no such point of contact already developed in the expectation of a Redeemer, in the person of the promised Messiah, as existed among the Jews. There was here no such uninterrupted series of testimonies to a living, self-revealing God, upon which the gospel could attach itself as that which was announced and prepared before-hand through these testimonies, in like manner as upon the law and the prophets among the Jews. Nevertheless the annunciation of a Redeemer still found a point of contact in the universal feeling implanted in the very nature of man, the feeling of guilt and moral wretchedness, and in the consequent though dimly conscious longing for deliver-

¹ The words in 1 Cor. 7: 14, may be understood, it is true, in a two-fold manner. If with De Wette (l. c.) we understand the ὑμῶν as directed to *all* Christians,—which certainly in this connexion and on account of the use of the plural may be the more probable,—then the apostle draws the inference, that the children of Christians, although not yet incorporated into the church, not yet baptized, were still in a certain known measure to be termed ἁγία, holy; and this is De Wette's hypothesis. On this view, what we have said above in the text, readily follows as a necessary consequence. But even if we assume, that Paul is here addressing only those who were living in such a mixed wedlock, and that from the sanctification of the children of such a marriage he argues back to the sanctification of the whole conjugal relation,—a thought which certainly here lies nearer to the connexion,—then it would still follow, that Paul indeed pre-supposes a sanctification of the children through the connexion with believing parents, although he does not derive this from baptism; since the baptism of children in such mixed marriages could in many cases hardly take place. But if infant baptism had been at that time practised, he could not then have called the children of such mixed marriages ἁγία, holy, in the same sense as the baptized children of christian parents.

ance out of this condition ; and these feelings were now brought into livelier excitement through the circumstances of the times. The gospel indeed could not, as in its relation to Judaism, proclaim itself as the fulfilment of that which already existed ; on the contrary, it had to stand forth in opposition against that which already existed, against heathenism as the apotheosis of nature ; and it could therefore here attach itself only upon those inward convictions of an unseen and unknown God, which lay at the foundation of such an apotheosis. On the other hand, there was here the advantage, that there could not, so easily as from the position of Judaism, spring up the temptation to regard Christianity only as a supplement to what already existed, and wholly to mistake the new spirit which pervaded it and which aimed at the entire transformation of the whole life ; for to the convert from heathenism, to whom Christianity presented itself in opposition to his whole former religious position, Christianity must necessarily appear as something **WHOLLY NEW**, and destined to produce a total transformation of life. Meanwhile, although Christianity could here at first present itself to the consciousness only in opposition to heathenism ; yet those Christians who continued to live on in their former relations in the midst of heathen society, were so much the more exposed, in a *practical* respect, to infection from the heathen corruption of morals, before their christian life had become firmly established. And although it did not lie *so* near to their position as to the Jewish, to make out of faith itself an *opus operatum*, and thus to use it as a prop of licentiousness ; still, such a misapprehension ever arose readily out of human nature itself, even without the intervention of Judaizing teachers. It is apparent, that Paul held it necessary to guard himself and to warn others against this tendency.¹

Another peculiar danger also threatened Christianity, when it spread among the cultivated classes in those cities which were seats of Grecian learning. As here the love of science was especially predominant, and outweighed all other propensities of human nature ; as also Christianity in respect to knowledge imparted **FAR MORE** than heathenism ; and as in many points it coincided with those forms of Greek philosophy which rested on an ethical basis, in their opposition to the former popular religion ; it was therefore possible to make Christianity, in direct

¹ The *κενὰ λόγους*, vain words, against which Paul cautions, Eph. 5: 6.

contradiction to its nature and destination, predominantly a matter of science and transform it into a philosophy,—to subordinate the practical interest to the theoretical, and thus obscure the true essential nature of the gospel. But all this we shall have opportunity to develop more fully and to present in more striking points of view, in the history of the further progress of Christianity among the heathen, and the history of the particular churches established among them. We pass now to the second missionary journey of the apostle Paul.

ART. III. HINTS AND CAUTIONS RESPECTING THE GREEK ARTICLE.

By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. Andover.

It may not be amiss, very briefly to suggest the reasons why I have given the title above to the following remarks. I call them *Hints*, because it is not my present purpose to write a grammatical essay *in extenso* on the subject of the Greek article, in which I might endeavour to exhibit all its various phases and uses; nor is it my design here to exhibit, in a formal way, even an abridged account of these, which might hold a place in an ordinary grammar. Preparation to write a work of such a nature *in extenso*, after the labours of Kluit, Matthiae, Middleton, and others, must cost the labour of many years, in case the design should be (as it ought to be) to add something to the stock of knowledge already accumulated. Such labour my duties will not allow me to perform; and perhaps we shall see some reason to doubt, in the sequel, whether the subject itself is of sufficient importance to justify the laying out of such expensive effort upon it. But still, it is my intention to discuss, on the present occasion, some of the leading doctrines of the Greek article; and this discussion must necessarily take a grammatical hue, because it cannot be conducted in any other manner, so as to be solid and satisfactory.

I have added the word *Cautions* to the title of this essay, be-

cause of my sincere and full persuasion that the doctrine of the Greek article has very often been made too much of; for the presence or absence of this little word, has been made the turning point in some of the most important appeals that can be made to evidence, in the science of theology or philology. For example; Origen asserts, and after him a multitude of others have asserted, that in *καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, John 1: 1, *θεός* cannot designate the great and supreme God, because the article is wanting, which (in case it designated God supreme) must be supplied. So again in Tit. 2: 13, the phrase *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, has occasioned great and long protracted controversy, by giving rise to the question, whether the omission of the article before *σωτῆρος* necessarily unites it to *θεοῦ*, and makes both to relate to one and the same person; or whether the language as it now stands, is grammatically capable of being understood in such a way as to make a distinction between *θεός* and *σωτήρ*, the former being applied to God the Father, and the latter to Christ his Son. These are only a specimen of the questions that the Greek article has occasioned. Years of laborious effort have been devoted to some of these questions; and, after all, without satisfactorily accomplishing the desired end. Much of this labour has, in certain points of view, been lost to the world; because a little more accurate knowledge of the true nature of the Greek article would have effectually shewn, that in whatever way the investigation might terminate, the labour would in some respects be in vain; since the presence or absence of the article would, after all, decide nothing in a satisfactory way, so long as the usages of the Greek language would, in most cases, permit either, without any essential variations of the meaning. A true knowledge of this subject, I doubt not, would contribute greatly to narrow the bounds of controversy as it respects the declarations of the New Testament in several respects. Critics also, as well as theologians, would have less controversy than they have had, about many a various reading which has respect to the insertion or omission of the article. Those who reject with disdain this or that reading, because the article is present or absent, as the case may be, might, in many instances perhaps, find that their disdain was more the progeny of unacquaintance with the nicer shades of Greek grammar, or at least the laws of syntax, than of critical skill; yea, that in many a case, they were making much ado about—nothing.

I do not expect that the reader will believe all this on the ground of my assertion; nor do I wish that he should. If he does not see reason enough, in the sequel, for such remarks as I have made, then let him cancel them, if not from this book, at least from his mind. I ask for no credit upon trust. I have been obliged, in stating my reasons for the title given to this essay, in some measure to anticipate what I deem to be the result of its contents; and when the reader shall have gone through with these contents, I ask him then to turn back, and read the preceding remarks again, and inquire whether I have presumed more than I have proved.

It is one of the most singular phenomena that I know of in regard to language, that the Greek article has not yet received, as it would seem, a definition which is satisfactory to the great body of grammarians and critics. Nouns, adjectives, verbs, participles, and particles can be defined, and often have been, so that the great majority of those who speculate in these matters acquiesce in the definition. The verb and participle might, perhaps, be made an exception to this remark in certain particulars. Still, there is no controversy whether a verb is a noun, or an adjective, or other part of speech; and so in regard to the participle. But in respect to the article, there is still a contest concerning what it is, or at least what it originally *was* and still substantially is, although it may be employed with more latitude by the later than by the earlier Greek authors.

I cannot do requisite justice to my subject, without entering into this part of it with some degree of particularity. In the way of illustrating what I have just said, let me produce some of the definitions which have been given by some of the most celebrated grammarians and critics.

Aristotle, whom we might presume to be master of his own language, says: Ἀρθρον δέ ἐστι φωνῇ ἄσημος, ἢ λόγου ἀρχὴν ἢ τέλος ἢ διορισμὸν δηλοῖ, ὅσον τὸ φημί καὶ τὸ περὶ, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, i. e. the article is a sound without a signification, which marks the beginning or end of a sentence, or distinguishes, as when we say *the* [word] *φημί*, *the* [word] *περὶ*, etc." Middleton remarks on this, that "he despairs of discovering in it anything to his purpose;" and well he might say so, inasmuch as his purpose was, to shew that the article is in all cases essentially a *relative* pronoun, which it would be difficult enough to find in the definition of Aristotle. He conjectures, however, that as the article is usually prefixed to the *subject* of a sentence, i. e. to the

nominative case, this may tally with the first part of the definition, which refers, as is generally supposed, to the *prepositive* article; and the *subjunctive* article, ὅς, ἥ, ὅ, which is essentially a relative pronoun, is commonly used only when it is preceded by some phrase or declaration to which it refers, and therefore may be said to 'mark the end of such declaration.' But the misfortune is, the prepositive articles are often found in the *predicates* of propositions, as well as in the subjects, and that the subjunctive article is far from being always placed so as of itself to mark the end of a clause or sentence to which it relates.

But what shall we make of Aristotle's *φωνὴ ἄσημος*, a sound without a meaning? Are there any such words in any language? I am not aware of any. I know, indeed, that careless writers or speakers may employ many words that are superfluous and useless, so far as it respects the proper designation of what they mean. But this does not prove that there are any words which have of themselves no meaning; it proves only that the ignorant and the unskilful may abuse language.

One may here say, perhaps, that we must understand Aristotle as averring, that the article does not of itself designate any object, quality, attribute, action, etc. like the noun and adjective; nor, like the verb or participle, assert of these things any action or existence. But here again, where we seem to have obtained some light as to his meaning, we are met with the question: Which of all these does the *preposition* indicate? And is this a part of speech without a meaning?

Does he design, then, to convey the idea, that the article, in and by itself alone, has no significancy, but is dependent on its noun, etc. expressed or understood, for any and all of its significancy? Be it so; but how in this respect does it differ from the true and proper adjective, or the preposition, which in and by themselves alone have no proper significancy, being dependent parts of speech that show quality and relation only where the subject is expressed or understood to which they relate? If it be said, that the adjective often goes over into the noun, and so may have a significancy by itself; the answer is, that then as a *noun*, and not as a proper adjective, it has such an independent significancy. Besides, it is true of the article, also, that it often goes over into the demonstrative, and sometimes into the relative pronoun, and has the same significancy with these words. And even the preposition in some cases is used in like manner; as where the Greeks say *ἀνα* for *ἀνάστυθι*, *πέρα* for *πέρασι*, *ἐν* for *ἐνέστι*, *ἐν* for *ἐνέστι*, *ὑπο* for *ὑπéστι*, etc.

Still, my apprehension is that Aristotle did design, by his *φανή ἀσημος* to mark the usual fact, that the article in and of itself has no proper significancy like to that of nouns and verbs. But when we rigidly examine this definition, we find it to be defective; for, in the first place, the peculiarity here noted applies to some other parts of speech; and secondly, it is true, after all, of the article, that it does usually *specificate* the meaning of the words to which it is attached, or at least give them a meaning which may be called in some respects emphatic.

With Middleton we may say, however, that we despair of obtaining from the mighty master of logic and grammar, any just and adequate view of the nature of the article, by the definition which he has given.

The celebrated grammarian, Apollonius Dyscolus, who flourished about A. D. 150, although he has said much of the article, has left us no express definition of it, by which we can learn his views exactly. He asserts, indeed, that articles and pronouns are different things, and yet, that if the article loses its noun, it then becomes a pronoun. Middleton avers, in respect to him, that ‘he has many facts, for the most part corroborating the theory which he [Middleton] suspects to be the true one.’ This may be so; but the inquiry of most importance is, whether the Greek language itself corroborates this theory.

Let us hear another celebrated Greek grammarian, who lived in the fifteenth century. I refer to Theodore Gaza, whose grammatical work was the source and exemplar of almost all the earlier Greek grammars in western Europe. “The article,” says he, “is a declinable part of speech prefixed to nouns. It is, indeed, divided into the prepositive and subjunctive; but properly the prepositive only is the article.” He then adds, (what is the essence of his definition,) *ποιεῖ δ’ ἀναπόλησιν προηγνοσμένου τοῦ ἐν τῇ συντάξει*, i. e. ‘it serves to recall that which had previously been known (or mentioned) in the discourse.’

Here, indeed, we have one important remark, viz. that the *prepositive* article is the only real and true article. Why the so called *subjunctive* article should ever have been named otherwise than *pronoun*, it seems difficult to imagine. But we are not brought much in advance upon our way, by the rest of Gaza’s remarks. It is a very limited part of the article’s office, to refer merely to what has been suggested or recognized in previous discourse. Even if the old rule of definition here—a *potiori nomen fit*—were applied, we should hardly be able to defend

the definition of Gaza. Moreover, the relative and the demonstrative pronouns also serve to recall that which was mentioned or recognized in the preceding context ; and how does the definition of Gaza serve to distinguish the article from them ?

Mr Harris, who in his *Hermes* has written so many curious and in several respects interesting things concerning the philosophy of language, speaks of the article as being *nearly allied* to the pronoun, and remarks that they may be best distinguished by the circumstance, that "the genuine pronoun always stands by itself, while the genuine article requires a noun for its support."

Lord Monboddo, who has speculated much and often to very good purpose on language, and who was uncommonly well versed in the writings of the Greek philosophers and metaphysicians, remarks, that "the article is of as subtle speculation, as perhaps any thing belonging to the language ; particularly as it is used in Greek." In this he was beyond all doubt correct. He then goes on to show, that "its office is different from that of a pronoun of any kind, and that it deserves to be ranked by itself among the parts of speech." But after all, when he comes specifically to define it, he makes it "the prefix to a noun, denoting simply that the noun to which it is prefixed, is the same with that which was before mentioned, or is otherwise well known." But these uses of the article are far from being the only ones which it subserves. The definition, therefore, is incomplete. Middleton objects to this definition, however, that 'it makes the article *a distinct part of speech* ; and that if it be thus distinct, it is not conceivable that it should become a pronoun when (as Apollonius affirms) its substantive is dropped ; inasmuch as one distinct part of speech cannot go over into another.' But the correctness of this last remark will hardly be conceded. Does not an adjective often go over into a noun ? Do not the primitive *prepositions*, when they are joined in composition with a verb, become adverbs ? Do not forms of the infinitive mode very often become mere *nomina actionis*—simple nouns ? What then is the difficulty in the case before us ? Why cannot the article in certain cases, go over into a *kindred* class of words (to say the least), i. e. into a pronoun, although it be of itself a distinct part of speech ?

From this brief review of the former ancient and modern definitions of the article, let us come to those of some of our cotemporaries, who are, or have been, great masters in criticism,

lexicography, or grammar. Dr Middleton, to whom I have already more than once referred, published, some twenty years since, a treatise on the Greek article, which he entitled: *The Doctrine of the Greek Article, applied to the criticism and illustration of the New Testament*. In this he says, (p. 4 of the New York edit.) "The Greek prepositive article is the *pronoun relative* ὁ, so employed that its relation is supposed to be more or less obscure; which relation, therefore, is explained in some adjunct annexed to the article by the participle of existence expressed or understood." His meaning is, for example, that ὁ φιλόσοφος is in all cases equivalent to ὁ ὧν φιλόσοφος; in which case ὁ is the subject of an assumed proposition, ὧν the copula, and φιλόσοφος the predicate. According to him, then, the article stands in all cases, in connexion with its noun, in a proposition which differs from one that has a verb, only as an *assumptive* proposition differs from one that *asserts*, i. e. as ὁ ὧν φιλόσοφος differs from ὁ ἐστὶ φιλόσοφος.

To explain and defend this definition, he occupies twenty pages of his Essay. I have read this part of his work many times heretofore, and recently with all the attention that I could summon, and yet I feel compelled to say, that Aristotle's definition which has been cited above, and with which Middleton finds much fault, is at least as intelligible to me as that of his corrector.

What is a part of speech "so employed, that its relation is supposed to be more or less obscure?" Men employ language in order to clear away obscurity; and they always complain of an unskilful or ill use of it, when it is so employed as to be obscure. The author, however, to do him justice here, means to say, that the *relative* pronoun ὁ is so employed as to be *anticipative*, (which is sometimes the case with pronouns really relative,) and that the noun anticipated, i. e. the noun to which the article has reference, is to be fully known only by the mention of it in the sequel. For example; ὁ, *he who*, (for so, if Middleton be correct, we must translate it, when rigid exactness is applied to it,) stands with an uncertain meaning or reference, until ἄνθρωπος, φιλόσοφος, or some other noun is supplied. In this way a kind of *relative* meaning is made out for the article, and on this ground the author in question calls it a *relative pronoun*; contrary to the great mass of critics ancient and modern, who, when they admit its *pronominal* quality, always make it, in the main, a *demonstrative* pronoun. Matthiæ (Gramm. § 292) does, indeed,

admit that the article is used for the *relative* pronoun; but he limits this to the Doric and Ionic dialects and to the tragic poets only among the Attics. It should be noted, however, that this *relative* use which he thus admits, constitutes but a small part of the instances in which the article is employed.

In fact, if we are to name the article a pronoun in all cases, we must evidently divide the generic denomination into several species, viz. into the *demonstrative*, the most frequent of all in ancient times; the *relative*, which is less common, and somewhat peculiar to certain dialects; and what I would beg leave to name, the *anticipative*. The two former cases need no illustration; the latter may be easily explained. When I say *ὁ φιλόσοφος περὶπατεῖ*, without having made any previous discourse on this subject, the *ὁ* in this case is *anticipative* of some noun that is to follow. In one sense, if it be a pronoun at all, we may call it a *relative* pronoun; for it has a relation to a noun which is to follow. But for the same reason we might call an adjective a relative part of speech, or a preposition, or an adverb; for none of these are employed but in relation and subserviency to other words. Still, to confound an *anticipative* relation, one which in its own nature is so and always must be, with the idea of *relative* pronoun in the usual grammatical sense of this term, does not seem to be throwing any light upon our subject. In common grammatical parlance a relative pronoun always implies an *antecedent*, either expressed or understood. I admit that sentences are sometimes so constructed in poetry, and occasionally in prose, as that the relative pronoun holds a place actually before its antecedent. But it is, if I may be allowed the expression, only a physical place which it thus occupies. In the order of logic, of grammar, of sense, the antecedent of course must precede the relative pronoun. That there are innumerable cases of the article, in which it is not relative in any other than in the general sense above explained, and not in the technical one, need not be proved to any one who reads the Greek language. Indeed Middleton himself admits, and even labours to prove, that the reference of the article is *always* anticipative (p. 19). Yet in this position, the whole matter can hardly be placed. When the article is actually used as a relative pronoun, (and cases of this nature are not unfrequent, Matth. Gramm. § 292,) we may consider it as *retrospective* in the same sense as the relative pronoun is, for it is in reality a mere relative pronoun in this case. In all cases where it is so used, we may indeed repeat the noun

to which it relates; but then, this is never done by good writers, except for the sake of avoiding ambiguity in some peculiar cases.

To call the article a *relative* pronoun, then, and yet to make it always *anticipative*, seems to be nothing more than to change the usual meaning of words, without gaining any serious advantage.

We must delay one moment on another part of Middleton's definition. He says that 'the relation of the pronoun [article] is more or less obscure.' I admit, indeed, that when the article is altogether anticipative, as when it stands at the beginning of a new discourse, chapter, or paragraph, if the speaker or writer should stop with his *ὁ*, and suspend further declaration, no one else would be able to tell what noun should be supplied in order to make out the sequel. In such cases, I admit also, there would be more or less obscurity. But in the very numerous cases like the following, viz. *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, what obscurity is there in the reference or relation of the second *ἡ*? Certainly none at all. It is just as certain that this belongs to *πίστις* implied, as it is that the first *ἡ* belongs to *πίστις* expressed. So in *ταῖς φυλααῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*, in *τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς ἀγλ-
ους*, in *τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν*, and a multitude of the like cases. If it should be said that the article is here, in the second instance where it occurs, a relative pronoun; this will make nothing in the way of vindicating Middleton's assertion. He contends for its *relative* nature always and everywhere. But how, in such cases as the above, the more or less obscure is to be made out, I am not aware. Never were any cases of relation more plain, definite, and certain, than those of the repeated article above.

Pass we, now, to some other definitions. Let us examine the brief one exhibited by Passow in his masterly lexicon of the Greek language. "The article," says he, "represents its noun as a definite object, which is not blended with other individuals of the same kind, but is made prominent merely as an independent particular thing." This definition, of course, he intends for the article when conjoined with a noun, as its prepositive.

It may be said, now, in relation to this account of the article, that it does not reach the whole extent of the case. The prepositive article surely is not limited to those cases only where individuals belonging to a species are specified. On the other hand, innumerable cases occur, where it is prefixed to a noun which designates a whole genus; e. g. *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*, *οἱ ἄγγελοι*, *οἱ*

λύκοι, etc. So almost all abstract nouns take the article, as it would seem, for the very reason that they are generic; e. g. ἡ ἀρετή, ἡ φιλοσοφία, ἡ ἀδικία, ἡ δικαιοσύνη, etc. Then, again, the article is very often used in the case of *renewed* mention of a thing, where, in the first instance, the same thing was mentioned without the article, and where the noun itself is no more specific in its actual meaning in the one case than in the other. Whatever ground there is of its being specific, the basis of this lies in the fact, that in the second case there is a reference to its having been once named; and the article in this case has principally a *demonstrative* rather than a *specificating* power. For example; Matt. 1 : 20, ἄγγελος κυρίου (without the article), *an angel of the Lord*, but in v. 24, ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου, *THE angel of the Lord*, viz. the angel, or that angel before mentioned.

Passow, therefore, has given us only a partial account of the Greek article, in his definition of it; and this may be said with equal truth respecting the exhibition of its uses in his lexicon, although this exhibition is distinguished in several respects for its acuteness.

Bretschneider, in his lexicon of the New Testament, has given for substance the same definition, although in fewer words. "Articulus . . . ubique ponitur, ubi aliquid vel definite cogitatur vel enuntiatur, vel sua naturâ jam definita est." But is not Σωκράτης a definite subject? Are not θεός, κύριος, Χριστός, πατὴρ, ἀδικία, δικαιοσύνη, definite subjects; definite in their own nature, and definitely conceived of? And yet these and a host of other like words often appear without the article. What becomes then of the "*ubique* ponitur" of the author? Not to mention that the definition of the use of the article is quite too narrow for its limits.

The definition of that great master in the science of philosophical grammar, Philip Buttmann, is almost exactly the same as that of Bretschneider, and was probably the one which this latter author had in his eye, when he penned his remarks upon ὁ, ἡ, τό, in his lexicon. It runs thus: "The prepositive article is annexed . . . to every object which is to be represented as *definite*, either by means of the language itself, or from the circumstances." To remark on this, would be only to repeat what has just been said.

Come we then to Matthiæ, the ὁ πάντων of all *Thesaurus-masters* in Greek Syntax. It is seldom, indeed, that he will be

found tripping in these matters, to which he has devoted a most laborious life. "The article," says he (§ 264), "serves to show, that the noun with which it is connected, designates a definite object among several of the same kind, or a whole species." This last clause is an important and essential addition to the definition of Passow and others. But there seems to be still a deficiency in the definition; for what is the meaning of *definite*? Does he mean that the object must of course be *monadic*? Certainly not; as the sequel of his remarks abundantly shews. He afterwards tells us, that when a person or thing is defined by attributes, qualities, circumstances, office, station, etc. the article may be employed in naming those things which serve as an *appellative* to distinguish them; e. g. ὁ γέρον, ὁ γεραίος, ὁ αγαθός, αἱ ἀριστοί, ὁ μέγας, ὁ νεκρῶν, etc. It would be difficult perhaps, to introduce all these qualifying particulars into a definition; but they might at least be adverted to, so that the reader would be put on his guard against excluding them.

It might also be asked: Do not the thousands of cases in which adjectives and participles (when not used as nouns) take the article, deserve consideration in a definition of this part of speech? In what sense is a *definite individual* or a *genus* marked, when the article is thus employed? That there is *specification* of some sort, in such cases, I do not call in question; my only difficulty is, whether the definition before us comprises it.

Frederic Rost, who has made a very useful summary of Greek grammar, and especially of its syntax, has not given a formal definition of the article in any one passage; but he has given an account of its usages in such a way, that we may easily gather his definition from it. According to him, "it marks a particular individual belonging to a species; or it designates a genus, when it is regarded as a simple totality (without reference to individual parts), or when it is viewed in the light of antithesis to its opposites; and finally, whatever word designates special condition, attributes, circumstances, or relations, may take the article. Of the first part of the definition, no example is needed. Of the second we may give οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ ἄετοί, etc. for the first particular; for the second particular, we may take ὁ πόλεμος οὐκ ἄνευ κινδύνου, ἡ δὲ εἰρήνη ἀκίνδυνος, i. e. 'war is not without perils, but peace is not perilous.' Now if the first part of this sentence were to be asserted, without subjoining or meaning to subjoin the second or antithetic part, the form of it would be *anarthrous*, i. e. without the article; as πόλεμος οὐκ

ἔστιν ἄνευ κινδύνων. The article then has in some cases, yea, in many, an *emphatic* and *antithetic* power and design.

As to the last part of the definition, it may be easily illustrated. Examples may be found every where, such as ὁ γέρον, ὁ σοφός, ὁ τεθνηκώς, ὁ πλούσιος, ὁ ἐλήμων, etc. In a word, any designation which marks peculiar condition, circumstances, relations, qualities, actions, etc. may take the article, and thus be rendered in a certain sense *emphatic*, or specially worthy of notice.

We seem to be making some progress by the definitions of the two last named writers. Perhaps it would be difficult to produce a definition, to which one might not make as many objections as he could raise against that of Rost. I am well aware how much easier it is to pull down than to build up, in matters like that before us. If the reader should insist upon it now, that, after criticising so much on the definition of some of the great masters of Greek literature, I am myself under obligation to offer a definition which would exclude the faults on which I have animadverted, he would summon me to a task which I fear would not be satisfactorily performed. I have no pretence to hope that I should succeed, where those who are so greatly my superiors have failed. My full persuasion is, that more time and study are requisite in order to do justice to this subject, than either myself or others have yet bestowed upon it. That "truth is the daughter of time," seems to be applicable to this matter, as well as to some other matters of greater importance.

It seems to have been the conviction of Scaliger, that little of *terra firma* could be won, by efforts upon the Greek article. At least, when he called it *loquacissimae gentis flabellum*, we may suppose him to have been in an attitude of mind not unlike to the one attributed to him. This is, to be sure, a summary process with the whole matter; but not one which is adapted to give much light, or excite to much inquiry.

If I were to describe the office of the Greek article in the most generic terms that are admissible, I should say, perhaps, that 'it is a declinable part of speech, intended to serve the purposes of *specification*, either on account of *individuality*, or of *quality*, *condition*, or *circumstances*.' Adverbs, adjectives, and participles (used as adjectives,) may *qualify*; but they can hardly be said to *specify*. Pronouns, personal and demonstrative, may *specify individuality*, but they are not used for other specifications in the same manner as the article. It is true, that the article often serves a purpose like that which they subserve; and

then, when the article and pronoun are both used, they render still more specific and emphatic the word with which they are united. For example; ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ is more intensive than ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. But there are innumerable cases where no pronoun could serve the same purposes of specification as the article. In respect to οἱ ἄετοί, οἱ ἄνθρωποι, etc. it is plain that the sense would be entirely changed by writing οὗτοι ἄετοί, οὗτοι ἄνθρωποι, or ἐκεῖνοι ἄετοί, ἐκεῖνοι ἄνθρωποι, etc. In the last case there would be inevitably a reference to ἄετοί or ἄνθρωποι, express or implied, which had already been brought to view. But when the article only is employed before these nouns, this is not necessary. It may indeed be employed in case of the repeated mention of a thing; but it may also be employed where a genus or an individual is specified, to which no reference has yet been made; and employed for the purpose of distinguishing an individual or a species in some respect or other, either on account of individuality, or of relation, attribute, circumstances, etc. It answers, therefore, many a purpose which demonstrative pronouns do not; and consequently is not to be confounded with them, although, since it often approaches so very near to the same use with theirs, it not unfrequently is said to put on their nature.

The proper article always serves the purpose of *specification* in some respect or other. When we say ἡ πόλις, it refers either to the metropolis of the country, or to some neighboring city to which the mind of speaker and hearer is most naturally turned, or else to some city that has already been adverted to in previous discourse. In the last case, there is a near approach to the ancient *demonstrative* use of the article, of which so much is said by many of the recent grammarians and critics. The difference, in such a case, between *THE city I mentioned* and *THAT city I mentioned*, either in Greek or English, would be little or nothing, excepting in the mere form of expression. And so, in all the cases where an individual belonging to a class is distinguished by the article, it is of course *specification*.

It is equally so when a *generic* noun has the article; e. g. οἱ ἄετοί, οἱ ἄνθρωποι, etc. Here οἱ ἄετοί is not distinguished from other ἄετοί; for such there are not, the designation ἄετοί itself comprising the whole of these animals. But yet there is *specification* in this case, as plainly as in the other; for οἱ ἄετοί, generically considered, is a totality that is monadic or one, and as such it is distinguished from other classes of birds or any other animals. As a *genus* it is just as distinct among other *genera*,

as ἡ πόλις designating an individual city is distinct from other πόλεις. It is the logical conception, then, i. e. the idea of generic totality or unity, which the article marks, whenever it is prefixed to nouns in the plural that have a generic signification. Such a genus, taking into view the manner in which the mind conceives of it, is just as much *specific* as a single individual is. The same law, therefore, in regard to the use of the article, evidently applies to each. And from this it results, that generic nouns may be *anarthrous*, whenever the idea of specifying is not in the mind of the speaker or writer; and this, whether they be in the singular or plural. For example; in πόλεμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνευ κινδύνων, the word πόλεμος is intended to mean, not war specifically, or in distinction from something else, but was of any kind or at any time, i. e. any war whatever. But in the phrase, ὁ πόλεμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνευ κινδύνων, ἡ δὲ εἰρήνη ἀκίνδυνος, war is specifically conceived of in distinction from peace, and therefore the article becomes necessary in order to specify. Thus also in the plural, οὗτος κακοποιεῖ ἀνθρώπους, *this man abuses mankind*, i. e. any man or all men with whom he is concerned, or (in other words) he is a habitual abuser of his fellow-men. But οὗτος κακοποιεῖ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους would mean, that *this one abuses the man or the men*, who had already been mentioned or referred to, or who for some reason were already marked out or specified in the speaker's mind.

In the same way may we explain the use of the article in such cases as ὁ γέρων, ὁ ἄριστος, ὁ ἐλπίμων, etc. Here the individual who is distinguished by such an appellative, is conceived of by the mind as distinguished by the attribute or quality to which these names (and others like them) refer. He is therefore specified by the article. It is not individuality merely, as constituted by being *one* among a class of the like beings, which the article is employed to mark. Any attribute, quality, office, condition, relation, or circumstance, may also be marked by the use of the article, whenever either of these is designated by an appellative significant of it.

On the like ground we may account for the usage of the article in other cases. When employed before a neuter adjective which becomes an *abstract* noun, as τὸ καλόν, τὸ κακόν, etc. it is in reality used with a generic noun having the sense of *totality*, and therefore (when thus considered) of unity; and moreover, in all such cases there is a particular *specifying* power in the article, inasmuch as it serves to distinguish the quality or attribute

to which it is affixed, from other qualities and attributes which exist at the same time. The plurals of such adjective-nouns are subject to the same laws as the plurals already noticed above.

The same thing may be said, also, in relation to the article as used before a noun with the pronominal adjectives *οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, σός, ἐμός*, etc. all of which, from their very nature, make the noun with which they are united to be specific. For example; *ὁ ἐμός υἱός* means, either *my* [only] *son*, or *a son of mine* who had already been the subject of preceding thought or discourse; while *ἐμός υἱός* would mean simply *a son* (i. e. any son) *of mine*. In like manner *πᾶς* and *πάντες* admit the article when they mean generic totality, or when the noun with which they are connected has been previously mentioned; but they reject it when they mean only *every one* in the sense of *any one, whoever*, etc.

It is common, moreover, for adverbs to become adjectives or nouns, by prefixing the article. There is nothing strange in this. We have already seen that *appellatives* very often take the article, and usually do so when they are designed to attribute any quality, condition, etc. in a special manner to any person or persons. Now adverbs partake altogether of the nature of adjectives, as they always designate some quality, circumstance, relation, etc. When employed, therefore, by a license of language derived from common parlance, for nouns or adjectives, they become appellatives or attributives, and of course follow the same laws as these words do, in regard to the article; e. g. *οἱ παῖδες* the ancients, *τὰ ἄνω* the upper regions, *ἡ αὐριον* the morrow, etc.

The article is also put before the Infinitive mode, when this is employed (which often happens) as an indeclinable noun, or a *nomen actionis vel passionis*. But the principle in this case of employing the article, does not seem to differ from its common usages. The *nomen actionis* from its very nature is abstract and generic; and whenever the *genus* of action designated by it is intended to be marked in distinction from other classes of actions, or in such a way as to make it emphatic, then the article may of course be regularly employed.

Finally, the article is employed by the Greeks, when they cite a word, or a sentence, or a clause of a discourse, or use a word simply as such, without any reference to its signification. For example; *τὸ Ἑλλάς*, the word *Hellas*; *τὸ α*, the letter *Alpha*; "Then, said I, one thing yet remains, *τὸ, ἣν πεποιμεν ὑμᾶς, ὡς χρὴ ἡμᾶς ἀπειπαι*, [which is] *this*, [viz.] *if we can persuade you*

that it is expedient to dismiss us;" "What else means this saying, τὸ, οὐκ ἔχω ὃ τι χρήσωμαι τοῖς λόγοις, [viz. the saying] that οὐκ ἔχω κ. τ. λ." In these cases the demonstrative nature of the article is apparent; and, of course, its specifying power is quite plain. We might solve these and all other like cases, by the supposition that the article is used *elliptically*, i. e. that some noun to which it belongs, and which is naturally supplied by the mind, is implied. The like happens in cases almost without number; e. g. ὁ Φίλιππον the [son] of Philip, πορεύσθαι εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου to go into the [country] of Alexander. Very often such nouns as παῖς, υἱός, θυγάτηρ, χώρα, οἶκτα, ὁδός, ἡμέρα, χρόνος, ἔργον, πρᾶγμα, etc. are omitted, while the article supplies their place. Or we may solve them, by taking the whole clause that follows τὸ as constituting what is equivalent to a noun. But in all these cases, the nature of the article itself appears to be the same, and the use of it to be subjected to its ordinary laws.

In illustrating my views of the nature of the Greek article, I have, almost unconsciously, gone over nearly the whole extent of its usage. I advance these views, however, without any overweening confidence in them. I know too well, from past experience and from the example of others, on what slippery ground I am treading; and that while I may seem to have made out some plausible theory to my own satisfaction, a disinterested and acute observer may find cases which will at least seem to contradict the principles that I have assayed to explain and defend. Be it so. I shall still have the consolation, if my effort should call forth any sound criticism on the subject that will abide the test of thorough examination, of having contributed, even by my errors, to the advancement of knowledge in respect to the Greek idiom. I can only say, that no one would more sincerely rejoice than myself, in such an effort on the part of any one who does not accord with my views.

Before I quit, however, the general subject respecting the nature of the Greek article, I must add a few considerations which seem to be of importance.

In all the languages of which I have any knowledge, the parts of speech are essentially the same, the article only excepted. Their use, moreover, is substantially the same. In all languages we find nouns, verbs, adjectives, participles, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections. The form and derivation of some of these parts of speech, are indeed somewhat diverse.

In some languages a latitude, for example, is given to adverbs, which is not found in others. But I do not see how a language can exist, unless it has in substance, if not in form, all the parts of speech just named. By usage then, at least, they are *essential* parts of speech.

Not so, however, with the article. In Latin there is no such part of speech. In Syriac and Chaldee it can hardly be said to exist. Yet the Hebrew, the Greek, the English, German, French, Italian, etc. make it a kind of indispensable constituent. There is something singular in this phenomenon, and it deserves our attentive consideration.

It is clear, from the examples of the Latin, Syriac, and Chaldee, that the article is not an *essential* part of speech. The demonstrative pronouns in these languages, do indeed serve to supply to a certain extent the deficiency of the article. *Ille, iste, hic*, etc. in Latin, will of course cover that part of the ground belonging to the Greek article, which is occupied by its *demonstrative* power. But *aquilae illae* would answer but poorly to *oi aëtoi*, when used merely as descriptive of the *genus* of the bird in question. The eloquence of Cicero and all his power over language could not enable him to translate *adequately and fully*, into his own mother tongue, the simple words *oi aëtoi*.

Another circumstance, moreover, deserves especial consideration. This is, that no two languages which do employ the article, are throughout like to each other in their mode of employing it. The Greek introduces it in many cases where the English does not. The same is the case with the French and German. No two are bound by the same rules. Indeed there is so much that is idiomatic in each language, in respect to the use of the article; that an Englishman or American will find himself, in endeavouring to write or speak any of these foreign languages, as often in fault with regard to the article as in respect to any other circumstance whatever.

All the preceding considerations taken together serve to shew, that the article is not an *essential* part of language; nor, in cases where it is employed, is it always subjected to the same uses, or at least it is not in all cases deemed to be of the same, or even of any, importance. The Greeks used it often where we do not; yea, where the idiom of our language absolutely forbids it.

Further light may be cast on this part of our subject, which is very important to our purpose, by considerations drawn from the early usage of Greek authors. The assertions of ancient and

modern critics in regard to its use in Homer, are well known. So long ago as the time of Aristarchus, it was believed that the article of Homer is always a *demonstrative* pronoun; for that critic asserts this. (Matth. Gramm. § 264, 5.) Wolf, Koeppen, Heyne, Buttmann, Rost, Passow, and many others, assert the same thing. Heyne indeed goes so far, that when he finds cases in Homer that will not bend to this theory, he calls in question the genuineness of the reading, or rejects the verses which exhibit them as spurious. Wolf, however, after making the like assertions in his *Prolegomena* to Homer, revokes his decision in a note to Reitz *de Prosodia* (p. 74); where he says: "Pinguis quaedam scripsi de Homérico usu articuli, etc." Middleton (c. II. § 1), and Matthiæ (Gramm. § 264. 4, 5) have assailed the opinion of Aristarchus and the late critics; and, as I must believe, with most convincing evidence on their side. The poet says, Il. α, 11, Οὐνεκα τὸν Χρῦσιν ἠτίμησ' ἀρητιῆρα, where Heyne, Buttmann, and others, translate τὸν Χρῦσιν by *that Chryses*. But, as Matthiæ very justly observes, on this ground the poet must be supposed to appeal expressly to something as well known, independently of his poem; which is as little congruous with the manner of his poem, as with historical narration. So again, Il. φ', 317, τὰ τεύχεα καλὰ, Odys. ρ', 10, τὸν ξείνον δούστηνον, Odys. ι, 378, ὁ μύχλος ἐλαιονός, *that beautiful armour*, *that unhappy foreigner*, would give, says Matthiæ, a streak of modern sentimentalism to the passages; and *that olive-wood* would designate a particularity which would be altogether incongruous, since every one knows what *wood* is meant.

The numerous examples he produces of the ordinary usage of the article in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, in § 264. 4 of his Grammar, it would seem, must put this long agitated question to rest, if rest could ever be given to critics on the father of epic poetry. Still it is not so. Passow explains them all away thus: τὸν ἄριστον *him—the bravest*, τὸν δούστηνον *him—the unfortunate*, οἱ ἄλλοι *they—the others*, etc. In like manner do Buttmann, Rost, Heyne, and others, explain the same phenomena. But what is plainer than that, on the very same ground, one may eject the article from Plato, Xenophon, or any other Greek author, always making it a pronoun personal, relative, or demonstrative, and its noun a mere epexegetis, put in apposition with it? Is this *arguing* philologically? Or is it forcing our way through, in spite of all obstacles, in order to support a theory?

One thing is conceded on all hands, viz. that poetry employs

the article much less frequently than prose; that the oldest poetry employs it least of all; and that poets not Attic, seem to have omitted or inserted it almost at pleasure. Buttmann (§ 124. Note 4) asserts, that the use of it among them was altogether a matter depending on their own choice.

How can all this be true, if the article is an *essential* part of speech? I am aware, indeed, that poetry takes great liberties; in particular that poetry which depends for its rhythm on the quantity of syllables. But are none of the liberties of poetry allowed to prose? Does not that part of prose which approaches near to the language of conversation, take the same liberties which abound in the latter? We may very reasonably believe this; and we may also believe, that among other liberties taken by speakers and writers, that in respect to the article, which is so common in poetry, may also have been taken in prose, especially in such pieces as exhibit conversation-style.

The insertion or omission, then, of a part of speech *not* absolutely essential, cannot be expected to be fixed by the same certain laws which govern the use of the essential parts of speech. If poetry could omit or insert the article at pleasure, and yet sacrifice nothing of importance in regard to its perspicuity and propriety of language, we may well expect to find something of this in prosaic usage. The sequel will show that such an expectation is not without some solid ground to rest upon.

I beg the reader's indulgence, while I make one more remark, which may serve to cast some light on the facts which will be presented in the sequel. This is, that the *definiteness* or *distinction* of an object cannot be rationally supposed to be always dependent merely upon the real definiteness or distinction of that object in itself considered, either in regard to its individuality, or in respect to its attributes, relations, or circumstances. If the writer or speaker merely imagined or supposed it to be definite, or distinct, or intended to represent it as distinct, he would of course speak in the same manner as though it were really so. What he supposes, imagines, or intends, is reality to him. His *subjective* views are to him as *objective* ones. Hence it is not enough, in any particular case, for us in order to exclude or introduce the article in any text of a writer, to show merely what was reality in regard to the distinctness or the specificness of any object named by a noun, but we must be able also to perceive the state of the writer's mind, and to tell what views he had of the distinctness of the object in question, before we can

venture to say, with any good degree of certainty, whether he inserted or omitted the article. A due regard to this matter would probably compose not a few disputes of critics, about the insertion or rejection of the article in many a passage of Greek authors.

We shall see, moreover, that in a multitude of cases the *essential* meaning of a passage is not at all affected by the presence or absence of the article. So it is in our own language. When I say : 'Sight is more perfect than any of the senses,' does this differ *essentially* from the assertion : 'The sight is more perfect than any of the senses?' Certainly not. Still there is a slight difference between the two cases. *The sight* is more specific, and therefore more emphatic (in one sense of this word), than *sight*. The two assertions differ a little in the *colour*, while, if I may be allowed the expression, the *person* is the very same. And why may it not be so in Greek? It is undoubtedly so; at least if the reader doubts it, I hope to overcome his doubts before I finish the present discussion.

The way is now prepared to commence the execution of the main purpose of this essay. I am in the sequel to shew, that the article, as we might expect from the general survey which we have taken of its nature, is very often inserted or omitted *pro lubitu scriptoris*; at least, that so far as we can discern, the use of it is much more extensively left to the judgment, feelings, taste, or peculiarity of writers, than has been generally supposed or admitted. If this can be shown, the important bearing that it will have upon criticism in respect to the text of Greek books, and also in respect to doctrinal controversies about the meaning of particular passages, must be very evident.

It would carry me quite beyond the bounds of an essay, designed for a Miscellany like the Biblical Repository, to notice in succession all the instances in Greek, where the article, when apparently in the same circumstances, is sometimes inserted and sometimes omitted. Enough, if I bring to view all the great and important principles that respect the usage of this little word, and summarily glance at the rest.

I must make one other remark. The reader is not to suppose, where I produce but few examples, that only a few can be found. I purposely limit myself in most cases to a few clear and plain examples, in order that I may not tire his patience. When I deem it important, I shall point out the books, where he may find examples in greater abundance. As my object is not

a *controversial* view of the article, I purposely refrain from frequent reference to those books (such as that of Middleton and others), that treat of the article, and lay down rules, often without any exception or modification, which are here called in question or contradicted. My object is rather to inquire what is true, than to show that others are in the wrong.

1. One of the first and plainest rules respecting the article is, that it is prefixed to names of *monadic* objects, i. e. objects that exist singly and of which there is but one, or at least only one that from the nature of the case would probably be thought of.

Examples may be found on almost every page of Greek, in the New Testament and elsewhere; ὁ ἥλιος, ἡ γῆ, ἡ δικαιοσύνη, τὸ ἀγαθόν, etc. To establish the principle, that the article may be inserted in such cases, needs not any effort. Even the most common observer of Greek idiom must perceive it.

Yet wide as this principle reaches, and extensive as is its sway, directly the opposite principle reaches almost equally wide, and has a sway scarcely inferior. I begin with the New Testament for the proof of this; for this, the reader will continually keep in mind, is the main object of my present inquiries.

Here then a multitude of *monadic* nouns may be found, which occasionally are without any article; e. g. of concrete nouns or names of actually existing objects, as ἥλιος, γῆ, οὐρανός, θάλασσα, νῆξ, ἀγορά, ἀγρός, θεός, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πατήρ, ἀνὴρ, πρόσωπον, ἐκκλησία, δεῖπνον, θάνατος, θύρα, νόμος, νεκροί, κόσμος, ὥρα, ἀρχή, κύριος, διάβολος, etc. Whether such nouns as ἀρχή, ὥρα, and some others are really *concretes* or not, is of no consequence to our present purpose. The principle is equally clear in regard to undoubted abstracts; e. g. δικαιοσύνη, ἀγάπη, πίστις, κακία, πλεονεξία, ἀμαρτία, etc. I have not subjoined the places where these are to be found in their *anarthrous* state, because every one's Greek Concordance, and for the most part his *Lexicon*, will so readily supply them, that I do not deem it of any importance to mark them here.

What shall we say now to this great law of the article, viz. that monadic nouns demand it? What can we say, when the usage is almost equally divided, and in not a few cases predominant on the *anarthrous* side? Let the reader examine the cases in which the article is sometimes inserted and sometimes omitted, without any imaginable difference in the idea to be attached to the noun itself, and then he will himself be satisfied, that the article in such cases is inserted or omitted mostly *pro lubitu scrip-*

toris. When the writer wished to make the definiteness of the monadic object named, more obvious or more striking, he added the article ; when he was satisfied that the word itself was as specific as he wished it to be, he omitted the article. But in many of these cases the reason must have been *subjective* and not *objective* ; for it is in vain that we look for the grounds of his decision in the nature of the thing itself.

Nor must the reader suppose these apparently contradictory principles to belong only to the Greek of the New Testament. They are widely spread through the circle of even the very best classical Greek. "When the noun," says Matthiæ (*Gramm. II. p. 545*), "is of itself sufficiently specific, so that no distinction from other like things is required, the article may be omitted ;" i. e. one might almost be tempted to say, the very reason why the article is demanded, is the reason why it may be omitted ! And yet to say this would not be quite correct. The simple truth seems to be, that the names of specific and definite objects may be distinctly marked by prefixing the article, if the writer or speaker pleases so to do ; but if (for brevity's sake) he chooses to omit it, there is no hazard in doing it. The usages of the language permit him so to do.

This, indeed, gives a different view of the matter ; one like to a multitude of cases in our own language. If I say : "The sight is more perfect than any sense ;" or, "Sight is more perfect than any sense ;" either is good English, and either conveys my meaning with about the same force. All the difference that I can perceive is, that the one is more *specific* than the other in the mode of its diction. When I say *the sight*, I indicate that I am viewing this sense directly as compared with my other senses, and therefore thus distinguish it ; when I say *sight* merely, comparison is not indicated by this expression, but merely by the sequel of the sentence. These are, indeed, some of the nice shades of language ; but they are not the less real because they are nice.

So again I may say : "The thing I desire," or, "The thing which I desire." The former is indeed elliptical ; but who will forbid ellipsis, especially in poetry, and conversation, and indeed in all that requires breviloquence ? Whether I insert or omit the *which*, makes no important difference whatever in the sense. When inserted, you may say that the sentence is more exactly put in full grammatical costume.

If the reader, now, will apply the substance of such principles

as are concerned with these and the like phenomena, to the case immediately before us, he will cease to wonder at the presence or absence of the Greek article, in cases such as those that have been specified. Of one thing, however, he must be duly advertised before I shall consent to let him go. This is the *wide extent* of the principle in question, in the language of the Greeks.

Wide indeed is the range of monadic objects, concrete or abstract, which may receive or reject the article, as the writer on the whole judges best. It embraces all the great objects in nature or art that are single; it comprises all the names of arts, sciences, trades, peculiar employments, virtues, vices, affections; yea, all the *proper* names of specific objects, whether of men, animals, or any other thing. Hence we have no difficulty when we find Plato saying *ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ζῶσιν*, Phaed. p. 68; or Xenophon asserting, *ἐργασίαν εἶναι καὶ ἐπιστήμην κρατίστην, γεωργίαν*, Oecon. 6. 8. All is easy of solution, too, when we find such nouns as *ἵππικῇ, μαντικῇ*, etc. anarthrous; and so the large class of nouns like *δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη, ἀρετή, κακία, ἀκολασία, δέος*, etc. in such writers as Xenophon and Plato. So likewise *ὀλιγαρχία, μοναρχία, δημοκρατία*, and the like; *πόλις, ἀγρός*, etc. when the nature of the case shews what city or field is meant; also *δεῖπνον, πατήρ, γυνή, παῖδες, βασιλεὺς*, and a multitude of the like things, when from the connexion in which they are mentioned, they are plainly of themselves specific, may take or omit the article at the pleasure of the writer. So in Plato's Phaed. pp. 68, 69, *σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη*, etc. with and without the article. In some cases it is omitted, even where the noun is made as specific as possible by an epexegetical clause; e. g. *νῦν γὰρ ὑπὲρ ψυχῶν τῶν ὑμετέρων ὁ ἀγών, καὶ ὑπὲρ γῆς ἐν ᾗ ἐφυτε, καὶ ὑπὲρ οἰκῶν ἐν οἷς ἐτράφητε, καὶ περὶ γυναικῶν δὲ καὶ τέκνων*. Here *ψυχῶν, γῆς, οἰκῶν, γυναικῶν, and τέκνων*, are all as definite as possible, and yet not one of them has the article. The passage is in Xenophon's Cyrop. 3. 3. 44.

In a multitude of instances which are of this nature, the form *without* the article, and this moreover in case of a monadic object, is even the law of the language. Thus *ἐν κυρίῳ* in the New Testament, in such phrases as *οἱ ἐν κυρίῳ*; thus *ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ζῆν, ἐν σοφίᾳ πράττειν*, and almost all cases where the noun is used in a kind of adverbial way. So too among the Attics, *ἠγείσθαι θεοὺς, to believe in the gods*; while Euripides says, Hec. 800, *τοὺς θεοὺς ἠγούμεθα*. The reason is, that he wishes to give a little more definiteness than was usually necessary, to

the appellative *θεός*. How much *Zersplitterung* the observance of this simple and widely extended principle would have saved Middleton, Wahl, and some others, in their exceedingly numerous canons respecting the article, must be plain to every considerate reader.

Proper names have often been the subject of much remark. The more general principle seems to be, that in cases of *original* mention they are without the article; and in cases of *renewed* mention, the article is added. But here exceptions to both principles may be found without number. For example; the genealogical catalogue in Matt. i, inserts the article throughout when a name is first mentioned, and omits it when the name is repeated; as *Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαὰκ Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ*, &c. &c. Middleton says, that "this is wholly foreign from the Greek practice." It may be, that no example like this in a Greek genealogy can be produced; but then the form of the Greek genealogy is different, and more like to that in Luke. But as to the *principles* here exhibited, a multitude of examples may be found in Greek to justify the insertion and the omission of the article. No law of the language is trespassed. If the writer of the genealogy in Matt. i, wished, in each case, to specificate in a particular manner the *son* of each individual named as a father, he has chosen an effectual method of doing this. Having once done this, he chooses, it would seem, to omit any further specification as unnecessary. And this he might do, without transgressing any law of the Greek language. Undoubtedly he might have chosen the opposite course, had he thought it expedient. What remains then, except that the article was inserted or omitted at the will of the writer?

And so in a multitude of cases in the New Testament, in Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, and others, in respect to proper names of persons, or of countries, towns, etc. In the New Testament, however, the names of countries more usually take the article. Yet *Αἴγυπτος* never has it; and in many other names the usage is variable. The names of *towns* more often exclude the article; yet here there is no fixed principle, even in regard to the same words. And as to the names of *persons*, there is confessedly no rule that can be laid down.

How large a proportion of all the words which may receive the article, is included in nouns that are properly *monadic*, it would be difficult to say. It is perfectly evident, however, that a very wide circle of words come within the descriptions above

named. In respect to all these, any decision by a *dictum magistri*, whether the article is to be admitted into the text or rejected, is altogether aside from the proper sphere of criticism. As the article may, so far as the nature of the Greek language is concerned, be inserted or omitted, so the question whether it belongs to this word or that, when designating a monadic object, must be a question for the most part of mere fact, viz. whether the best Codices admit or reject it. Decisions on grounds *a priori*, or from the genius of the Greek language, or by virtue of high critical skill, would seem, one and all, to be out of place.

It is equally plain, also, that nothing important in an *exegetical* point of view, can, in cases of such a nature, be built upon the presence or absence of the article. The amount of all which can be said, is, that the writer or speaker who employs it, has given a *specificness* to his phraseology which is intensive; while the definite nature of the noun itself would have authorized him to omit the article, if he did not wish to render prominent the specificness in question. I do not aver, that a people of so nice a taste as the Greeks, had not their *right* and their *wrong*, in respect to the use of the article in most cases. But much of this seems to be within the province of rhetorical taste or *Aesthetics*, than within the province of exegesis. That their best writers differ so much in the use of the article; nay, that the same writer differs oftentimes with himself, is evidence enough that no inconsiderable portion of the ground occupied by the article depended more on the will of the writer, than on an imperious law of the language itself.

2. Intimately connected with the principle already developed, is a second phenomenon in Greek syntax. This is, that *when a word is rendered particularly definite by some adjunct connected with it, it may admit or dispense with the article.*

A Genitive case following a noun, as *ἡμέρα ὀργῆς*; or a pronoun personal or possessive, as *πρόσωπόν μου, σὸς πατήρ*; also some adjectives, like *πρώτη*, etc. and so of some other words; manifestly render the object with which they are connected *specific*. For example; *ἡμέρα ὀργῆς* is, from the very nature of the case, distinguished from other kinds of days, such as days of joy, feasting, etc. and even from common days that are not distinctly marked. So *πρόσωπόν μου* is individually specific; as is *σὸς πατήρ, ἡμέρα πρώτη*, etc. We might expect, therefore, that according to a common principle of the Greek language such definite nouns would take the article. And so

they often do; and we may even say, that they more usually take it. But still, as has been explained under No. 1, the very fact that the *adjuncts* in question render the noun specific, is the reason why the article may be omitted.

Thus Matthiae states the principle in his Grammar, § 265. He remarks, also, that nouns coupled with the pronouns demonstrative, οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος, often take the article; which, in such a case, renders their specific nature still more prominent. But in this case also, he adds, the article is *often omitted*, at least in poetry. Of this he produces examples; viz. τοῦδε ἀνδρός, οὗτος ἀνὴρ, etc. In prose, when the demonstrative *precedes* the noun, the latter usually takes the article; and such seems to be the New Testament usage, nearly if not quite throughout, where αὐτός is used as a pronominal adjective. But when the demonstrative *follows* the noun, the latter may omit the article; e. g. κίνησις αὐτή, αἰτία αὐτή, ἐπὶ γῆν τήνδε, etc. At least this idiom is often employed in the classic writers, although I do not find it in any incontrovertible reading of the New Testament.

The cases in the New Testament, where the article is inserted before the noun coupled with an adjunct that renders it definite, are to be found every where. Thus I open my Greek Testament at Matthew III, and find in quick succession, ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις, τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ, τὸ ἐνδυμα αὐτοῦ, τὴν ὄσφυν αὐτοῦ, ἡ τροφή αὐτοῦ, τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, &c. &c. But examples just the reverse of these, in respect to the article, are to be found in abundance; e. g. Matt. 17: 6, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. (So Sept. Is. 49: 23, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς.) Luke 1: 51, ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ. Eph. 1: 20, ἐν δεξίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Luke 19: 42, ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. 1 Cor. 2: 16, νοῦν κυρίου. Luke 2: 11, εἰς πόλιν Δαβὶδ. 2 Thess. 2: 2, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Acts 12: 10, φυλακὴν πρώτην; and so in a multitude of cases noted by Winer in the third edition of his New Testament Grammar, § 18. 2.

Nor does this belong to any negligence or want of skill in the New Testament writers. The classic Greek exhibits the same phenomenon; e. g. περὶ καταλύσεως τῆς στρατίας, Xen. Cyrop. VI. 1. 13; ἐν καταλύσει τοῦ βίου, id. Apol. Soc. 30; ἐπὶ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου, id. Mem. I. 5, 2; βίον αὐτῶν, Lucian, Scyth. 4; ὑπὸ μήκους τῶν ὁδῶν, Strabo, XV. p. 719; and so oftentimes elsewhere.

The reader will observe, that in a great many of these cases

the noun by itself is definite and specific ; yet in others it is not, but merely of a generic nature, and becomes specific only by reason of the adjunct. When, however, it is specific, whether by itself or from some extraneous cause, the article may be inserted or omitted. I will not say that it is a matter of entire indifference whether a writer insert or omit it. This I should hardly be willing to admit. But thus much we may say, viz. that unless the writer wished to make specification emphatic, he was at liberty to omit the article. No *essentially* different meaning is conveyed in either case ; it is only a modification of the degree of specificness which is marked.

We have now considered, under the two heads above, a great proportion of the cases in which the Greek article is employed. Both these heads belong essentially to the same category, so far as the principle respecting the insertion or omission of the article is concerned. They differ from each other, however, in this respect, viz. that No. 1 exhibits only cases where the noun is in its own nature specific ; while No. 2 embraces other nouns of a different nature, and the specific nature of the noun is here considered principally as determined by its adjuncts.

The importance of the principles developed under these two heads, will be more distinctly seen when we come, in the sequel, to make an application of them to some contested cases in the exegesis of the New Testament.

3. In most treatises on the article we find it laid down as a rule, that *the subject of a proposition must have the article, and the predicate omit it.*

So much, no doubt, is true with respect to this canon, viz. that the subject is, much oftener than the predicate, a specific and definite thing or agent. In a multitude of cases the object of a proposition is to shew, that a particular subject belongs to this or that class of things or persons ; in which case of course the subject would take the article and the predicate omit it. But the insertion or omission, in these cases, depends not at all on the mere fact that a noun is the subject or predicate as such, but on the simple fact whether the writer means to specify or not, in either case. Consequently we may expect, that if in any instance he wishes to make a specific predicate, he attaches the article to it. Thus in the New Testament ; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, Matt. 6 : 3 ; ἐκεῖναι ἐσσι τὰ κοινούντα, Matt. 7 : 15 ; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος, Matt. 12 : 7 ; ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός, 1 Cor. 10 : 4 ; ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία, 1 John 3 : 4 ; ἡ δύναμις

τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ νόμος, 1 Cor. 15 : 56; αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, Eph. 2 : 14; and so in cases very numerous, as fully established by Winer, § 17. 5. In some instances the very same construction in respect to definiteness exhibits and omits the article; e. g. John 8 : 44, ὅτι [ὁ διάβολος] ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ. Matthiae remarks, also, that in some cases it is a matter of indifference, whether the article be inserted or omitted in the predicate; as [πεῖσαι Θεονόην] σὸν ἔργον, or σὸν τοῦργον, i. e. τὸ ἔργον.

So far, then, is the alleged rule from being universally true, that the reverse, in a certain sense, is true. The predicate, or the subject, takes or omits the article with equal certainty, whenever the nature of the case is such as to require it. Propositions in which both omit it, are very common; e. g. πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος· καλὸς θησαυρὸς παρ' ἀνδρὶ σπουδαίῳ χάρις ὀφειλομένη. In other cases the subject may omit the article and the predicate take it; e. g. εἰρήνη ἐστὶ ταγαθόν (τὸ ἀγαθόν) τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἡ κόλασις ἐστίν· τοῦτ' τὸ κράνιον ἡ Ἑλένη ἐστίν, where, however, the subject also has the article.

Glass and Rambach long ago called in question the rule that we have now been examining; and Winer and Matthiae have most fully shown how small a claim it has upon our acknowledgment.

4. A fourth principle usually laid down in respect to the article, is, that *an appellative subjoined to another noun by way of apposition, when it is asyndic, i. e. without a conjunction before it, takes the article.*

That such is the usual fact I admit. But the rule itself needs much limitation, before it can be called even tolerably correct. If the object of the appellative, i. e. the word put in apposition, is to specify and distinguish the preceding noun as only an individual belonging to a class which is designated by the noun in apposition; or to shew that the attribute, quality, or office designated by the noun in apposition, is appropriate only to the person or thing in question; then the word in apposition takes the article; otherwise, not. Thus, for example, Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς, Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, and in the classics, Κλυζάρης ὁ τοῦ Ἀστυάρχου παῖς, Πιττακὸς ὁ Μυτιληναῖος, etc. Examples may be found every where, so that it would be superfluous to exhibit more. In the first example here, Agrippa is named *the king*, because he is thus distinguished from other individuals, of the same name; in the second, John is called ὁ βαπτιστής, because the office of baptizing was appropriate in a specific manner

to him. In these and all the like cases, the object of the noun, adjective, participle, or whatever it may be, which is put in apposition as an adjunct designed further and particularly to describe the individual or the thing already named, should take the article, in order to answer fully the intention of the speaker or writer with regard to the design of specification.

But if a word is added in the way of apposition, when the writer has no *particular* purpose of specifying, but only a general one of giving without emphasis an appellation that is often or usually bestowed, then the noun in apposition does not take the article; e. g. *Ἡρόδοτος Ἀλικαρνασσεύς, Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος, Βρόννος Γαλατῶν βασιλεύς*, etc. In the New Testament we find the same usage; e. g. *Σίμων βυρσεύς*, Acts 10: 32; *Ἄννα προφῆτις*, Luke 2: 36; *Γάιος Δερβαῖος*, Acts 20: 4; *Τιβερίου Καίσαρος*, Luke 3: 2; *Φαραὼ βασιλέως*, Acts 7: 10, etc. The omission of the article in such cases does not destroy the designation of *individuality*; for in each of these cases that fully remains. But the writer, when he omits the article before the adjunct, shows that he does not intend to give any peculiar prominence to that adjunct. He names it in order to remove doubt as to the person intended; but he omits the article, because he does not wish to urge upon the reader's mind the particular consideration of the attribute, etc. designated by the adjunct. Thus we may translate *Σίμων βυρσεύς*, *Simon a tanner*, i. e. who was one of the class of tanners; and so in other cases, *Anna a prophetess*, i. e. one who belonged to this class of persons; *Gaius one of the Derbaceans*; *Tiberius one of the Cæsars*, etc. All that need to be said in these and the like cases, is, that the writer did not mean to be particular in specification.

It is plain enough from these examples, how much the rule under examination must be modified. But we have not yet done with the subject. We may go a step further, and say that examples may be produced, where just the reverse of the practice which the rule recognizes, takes place. In all the cases hitherto adduced under this head, the reader will perceive, that the original or first noun, to which an adjunct is made, or with which another word is put in apposition, omits, or (we may say) rejects, the article. Buttmann (§ 124. 3) says expressly, that 'the article is *always* omitted [in the proper name,] when that proper name is followed by a more definite attribute with the article.' This may be true; and, so far as my observation goes, is true. But if he means that the adjunct itself always has the

article (for this is the general fact,) and that the proper name which precedes, is of course destitute of it, this will not abide the test of examination. Homer himself, at the very outset, presents us with a usage which is just the reverse of this: *Οὐνενα τὸν Χρῦσιν ἡτλησ' ἀρητῆρα*, Il. α. 11. Here *Χρῦσιν* has the article, and the adjunct *ἀρητῆρα* is without it. But you may say: This is poetical license. I answer in the negative; for Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon exhibit the same usage. For example; *ὁ Ἄλυσ ποταμός*, Herod. I. 72, 75; *ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰγρίαν ποταμόν*, Thucyd. VI. 50; *ἐπὶ τὸν Ζάβαιον ποταμόν*, Xen. Anab. II. 5. 1. Not unlike is *ὁ θῆρ Κένταυρος*, in Soph. Trach. 1162. In this last case, we may say that *Κένταυρος* is used with the liberty so common to proper names and monadic objects, as explained under No. 1 above. In the other cases, the proper names with the article, are very specific. The addition of *ποταμός* merely would, to all intents and purposes, be specific enough to distinguish Halys (for example) from any lake, town, etc. of the same name. And this seems to be all that the writer aimed at. Or we may regard the whole as a kind of compound name, (such as we form in English when we say *derivation-ending*, *termination-change*, etc.) and the article as standing before this composite noun.

The reader must begin by this time, if not before, to suspect that there are few rules concerning the article, which do not admit of modification and exceptions; or rather, which do not imperiously demand them. In the case just reviewed, how often must the insertion or omission of the article depend entirely on the *subjective* view and intention of the writer! If he designed to make the adjunct attributive a matter of speciality, and to render it prominent to the reader's mind, he gave it the article; if he did not, he omitted the article; while the real nature of the noun and its adjunct might in either case remain the same. What is this, but saying that the article in such cases is very much dependent on the will of the author? And who can prescribe a law for this?

From the consideration of nouns added by way of explanation and put in apposition, we may naturally advance to the examination of other words added with the like design and placed in similar circumstances. These may be adjectives, or participles, or nouns connected with prepositions, or in the genitive without them. Let us examine these in the order suggested.

(a) The adjective is often placed between the article and the

noun which it qualifies; e. g. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος, ὁ σοφὸς βασιλεὺς, ἡ μεγάλη πόλις, etc. In this case the noun and its adjunct (adjective) are virtually made one, and but one article therefore is required, where the article is employed. But different from this, in regard to the mode of structure (if not of signification,) is the case, when the adjective, as is very common, is put *after* the substantive; as ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀγαθός, ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ σοφός, ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, etc. In this latter case, there is a kind of apposition, altogether of a nature similar to that which exists, when one noun is put in apposition with another. And here the principle that the adjunct, when an adjective, should take the article if the noun has it, is very general; most grammarians say, universal.

Yet there is some doubt hanging over this canon, notwithstanding the ingenious efforts of Buttman and others to explain it away. In 1 John 5: 20 we have ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, although with variation of Mss. In Luke 12: 12, Griesbach and Schott give τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἅγιον instead of τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. In 1 Cor. 10: 3 we have an undoubted reading of the like kind, viz. τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικόν—τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα πνευματικόν. In Gal. 1: 4 we have τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ. Winer solves these last examples, by saying that ‘the adjective and the noun flow together into one word.’ But this is rather cutting the knot, perhaps, than untying it. We might better say this, when two nouns come together like ὁ ἄλυσ ποταμός, or when an adjective is manifestly designed for close connection, like the case of ἡ μεγάλη πόλις. I am unable to see any good reason here, why πνευματικόν and πονηροῦ would have a different meaning, if the article were placed before them.

Examples of the like nature occur in the classics. In Soph. Oedip. Tyr. 526, we find ὁ μάντις τοὺς λόγους ψευδεῖς λέγει. Matthiae (§ 277. 6) says, that we are to translate this in the following manner: ‘The prophet utters words, *which are false.*’ That we *may* so translate it, is no doubt true; that we *must*, is less certain. And in like manner he solves the numerous cases of this kind, which he produces from the classics. So Buttman also (§ 125. Note 3) resolves the like phenomena. In cases such as ὅλην τὴν νύκτα, ἔχει τὸν πέλκυν ὀξύτατον, he holds the adjective to be a kind of *predicate* of the sentence, so that if we were to translate, *the night which is whole* or *the whole, the axe which is very sharp*, we should then, and then only, come very near to the meaning of the Greek.

But not to insist here, that between a *very sharp axe* and an *axe which is very sharp*, there is at least no very great difference, certainly not an assignable one, what shall we say to the suggestion which is involved in this theory, viz. that the article which serves almost every where to render words definite and emphatic, would here deprive adjectives of the emphasis, which Matthiae and Buttmann assign to them when they are without the article? I can indeed imagine, that in pronouncing the words τὸν πέλκυν ὀξύτατον, the speaker may pause a moment, after uttering πέλκυν, and then throw emphasis into his voice when he utters ὀξύτατον. In this way, I suppose the repetition of πέλκυν by the mind would naturally be suggested, and ὀξύτατον may agree with this implied noun, and may, as we have seen under the preceding head dispense with the article. But that the mere fact of *omitting* the article should make the adjective emphatic in its meaning, or give it a speciality of meaning by making it a predicate, is somewhat difficult of explanation. What is the meaning of ὄλην as a *predicate*, in ὄλην τὴν νύκτα?

I should deem it arrogance hastily to pronounce sentence against the decision of such judges in respect to a question concerning Greek idiom, as Matthiae and Buttmann. But if we may resort to analogy in the case now before us, where shall we find one to justify the idea, that the omission of the article renders the meaning more emphatic or energetic? And if I rightly understand the object to be attained by making the adjective a predicate in the cases above, it is this, viz. that a special force of assertion or emphasis is thus thrown upon the adjective.

But Buttmann has adduced other examples, which seem to speak more favourably for his mode of representation, than those which I have presented above. He says, that ἡδερο ἐνὶ πλουσίοις τοῖς πολίταις does not mean: "He rejoiced on account of the wealthy citizens," but, "He rejoiced on account of the citizens because they were wealthy." So too, ἐπ' ἄκροις τοῖς ὄρεσι does not mean: "On the mountain tops," but, "On the mountains where they are highest." In this last case one is tempted to ask, Where then are they highest, except at the *tops*? It might be said, indeed, that there are, on most ridges of mountains, higher and lower summits; and that to say *on the mountain tops* might mean some of the lower ones. But who in speaking of the *top* of the White Mountains would think of any other peak than that of Mount Washington? Or who in speaking of the *tops* of the Andes, would think of any other sum-

mits than those of Chimborazo and some of its compeers? This example, therefore, does not seem to make much for the object on account of which it is adduced.

As to the other, one might say, indeed, that there is a difference between *rejoicing on account of the wealthy citizens*, and *rejoicing on account of the citizens because they are wealthy*. In the first case the expression might indicate, that the rejoicing was (for some cause or other not explained) merely with, or on account of, that class of citizens who were wealthy; in the other it might mean, that the rejoicing was because the citizens in general had become wealthy. But is not the meaning of such an expression rather to be explained by the context, than by the mere force of the words themselves? In the case before us, Buttmann does not give the source of the expression, and therefore I cannot resort to the context for examination; but from the very nature of the case I venture to say, that previous narration of some kind or other explains the manner in which the phrase quoted is to be understood; and I venture also to add, that it is rather on this ground, than on that of the omission of the article, that the exegesis in question rests. My reason is, that there are cases presented by Matthiae, and by Buttmann himself, and also some exhibited above which are contained in the New Testament, where we are either obliged to forsake the idea of making an adjective a *predicate* simply because it is anarthrous, inasmuch as the sense will not bear it, or else where the meaning is scarcely, if at all, modified by such a procedure. May we not make the probable inference, then, that the explanation of such cases, as presented by Buttmann and Matthiae, is at least exposed to some doubts that are not easy of solution?

If the reader begins to think that some apology is due for dwelling so long on what he may deem one of the *minutiæ* of Greek grammar, I regard it as sufficient to say, that when any one ventures to call in question the opinions of such men as Buttmann and Matthiae, respecting a point of Greek idiom, he is bound by a sense of decorum to give reasons for taking such a step.

(b) Participles, one would naturally expect to follow the rules either of adjectives or of nouns with regard to the article, when they constitute an adjunct to any substantive. And such is in general the fact. But when participles put on the simple nature of nouns, (a case which is very frequent,) then they are of course treated as nouns; and the reader has only to look back in order

to see the general principles by which in such cases they are governed. For example; ὁ πειράζων, ὁ στείρων, etc. are by usage mere nouns indicative of particular agents. A very large class of participles, are those which are used as *attributives*, i. e. words which designate some quality, action, station, condition, etc. that distinguish a particular class of men; e. g. εἶσιν οἱ λέγοντες, *there are those who say*; οὐδ' ὁ ὑπαρξέων οὐθ' ὁ καλύσων πάρα, *no one is present who will help or hinder*, Soph. Elect. 1197. Here we might translate, *the sayers, the helper, the hinderer*; although the English would scarcely be tolerable. But the idea is given by such a version; and at the same time the reason is shewn, why a certain class of participles may be called *attributives*. Now when they become so, and when they thus appropriate certain actions, qualities, condition, etc. to a particular individual, or to a particular class of men, we may of course expect them to follow the rules of specification, i. e. to take the article as a general thing. Examples besides those already produced, may be found every where; e. g. ὅτι μέλλουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι αἰρεῖσθαι τὸν ἐροῦντα, *that the Athenians would choose the speaker*, i. e. the individual who is to make the address; while in English we should more usually say, *a speaker*. So εἶχε τοὺς συμπαθήσοντας· χαλεπώτερον . . . εὐρεῖν τοὺς βουλομένους ἄρχειν, ἢ νῦν τοὺς μηδὲν δεομένους. In the New Testament, examples offer themselves every where; e. g. μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς, Gal. 1: 6; τινὲς εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς, Gal. 1: 7, a striking example, inasmuch as one might naturally say, that τινὲς of course makes the proposition of an indefinite nature. This indeed is true, so far as τινὲς is concerned; for stopping with τινὲς εἰσι we should render the phrase, *there are some*. The addition of οἱ ταράσσοντες, however, limits the τινὲς to a certain class of individuals, viz. that class who make disturbance or occasion trouble. In Gal. 2: 6, οἱ δοκοῦντες is descriptive of a class of persons, whose appearance or at least whose reputation betokens them to be superior persons; and so, in countless cases, *participial attributives* take the article, because they specificate an individual or a class as being distinguished by certain qualities, actions, etc.

Yet even here there are exceptions to the rule. E. g. πέμψαι προκαταληψομένους τὰ ἄκρα, Xen. Anab. 1. 3. 14. Other cases are referred to in Matthiae, § 268. In general, however, it is sufficiently plain, that participles when they stand not connected with any noun as qualifying or modifying it, but as descriptive

of a *class* of persons or things, (in which case we usually translate them by *he who*, *they who*, etc. do this or that, Latin, *is qui*, etc.) are in fact real *attributives*, which take the nature of appellative nouns, and should have the article whenever it is needed for the purpose of specification. As this is the usual purpose for which such participles are employed, of course they commonly take the article. But we have already seen, that the usage is not imperious. If a writer meant to use a participial appellative in a way like that of a noun when it is anarthrous, he was at liberty to make the participle anarthrous in the same manner; e. g. βοήσας *one who cries*, i. e. any one, Odys. ε, 473; νοήσας *an intelligent person*, i. e. any intelligent man, Hesiod, *Erg.* init. ὁμολογῶν μὲν ἀδικεῖν, ἀποθνήσκει, *any one who confesses wrong, dies*, Lys. p. 104, 28. Nay, in the very same sentence the great master of Greek style mingles both constructions: διαφέρει δὲ παμπόλῳ μαθῶν μὴ μαθόντος, καὶ ὁ γυμνασάμενος τοῦ μὴ γεγυμνασμένου, *he who learns, differs very much from him who does not learn; and he who is practised, from him who is not practised*, Plat. Leg. vii. p. 795. In English we render both clauses alike as to their definiteness; but in the Greek μαθῶν, etc. is without the article, while ὁ γυμνασάμενος has it. But enough; he who desires more abundant confirmation, may consult Matthiae § 271. Anm.

The cases already presented of the use of the participle, are substantially one and the same, although at first view they may seem to be a little diverse. To be distinguished, however, from both these, and really discrepant in some important respects, are those cases of the participle which are immediately connected with nouns, and which are employed to qualify or modify them in various ways. These require, therefore, separate and distinct consideration.

Participles, as qualifying nouns, may become, or at least be employed, as mere adjectives, and may assume the same intimate connection by position with the noun that they qualify. For example; ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς, Matt. 2: 2, where τεχθεὶς is to all intents and purposes disposed of as a mere adjective, although we can hardly make an adjective of it when we come to translate it. So again in the sequel: τὸν χρόνον τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος, v. 7, where φαινομένου is construed as an adjective; τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς, Matt. 3: 7; τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον, Matt. 4: 18; et saepe alibi.

But this construction does not need our renewed attention,

since the nature of it has already been noticed, p. 307. We come to a construction of more difficulty, and where usage varies perpetually in the Greek language. This is *where the participle follows the noun or pronoun which it qualifies or modifies*; in which case it takes or omits the article, according to the purpose of the writer, as it would seem, to give the idea which it designates more or less specification and emphasis. The insertion of the article gives it *Anhebung*, i. e. elevation, prominency, emphasis; the omission denotes that the writer did not intend to make specially prominent, the meaning which it conveys. Thus in Ephes. 1: 13, *εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον . . . τοὺς προηλπικότες ἐν τῷ χριστῷ*, where the idea conveyed by *τοὺς προηλπικότες* is designed to be prominent. So in Heb. 4: 3, *οἱ πιστεύσαντες*; and so *οἱ καταφύγοντες*, Heb. 6: 18; *τοῖς . . . περιπατοῦσιν*, Rom. 8: 4; *οἱ πιστεύοντες*, 1 John 5: 13; *ἡ σπιλούσα*, James 3: 6, and in many other instances.

On the contrary; participles often follow nouns and modify them, which *omit* the article; e. g. *τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλληθέντα*, Acts 23: 27; *ὁ θεὸς ἀναστήσας*, Acts 3: 26; but in Heb. 13: 20, *ὁ θεὸς . . . ὁ ἀναγαγών*, and then again in v. 21, with the same subject (*ὁ θεὸς*) we have *ποιῶν*. So *Φιλίππου . . . ὄντος*, Acts 21: 8; *ἡ . . . ἀκροβυστία . . . τελοῦσα*, Rom. 2: 27; *ὁ Ἰησοῦς κεκόπιακώς*, John 4: 6; *τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυροῦσης*, John 4: 39; *τὴν ἀδελφὴν οὖσαν*, Rom. 16: 1; *τοὺς λατρεύοντας . . . κεκαθαρμένους*, Heb. 10: 2; et alibi sæpe. In Pet. 5: 10 is an example that is instructive: *ὁ θεὸς, ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς . . . ὀλίγον παθόντας*. Here *ὁ καλέσας* throws emphasis by its article on the idea which it conveys, while *ὀλίγον παθόντες* omits the article because special stress is not here to be laid on the idea conveyed by it.

Pro arbitrio scribentis, then, may the article be employed in respect to participles, in a multitude of cases; for a multitude depend on his own intentions to render this or that idea emphatic. In many instances also, it would seem, does it depend on the *subjective* views only of the writer, whether the article shall be used or omitted; for, to say the least, no particular reason in many cases is discoverable by the reader from the nature of the context, why the article was inserted or omitted. Indeed the examples already suggested will serve to satisfy the reader of this. If he has any doubt, let him consult Winer, § 19, c. where he will find an accumulation of examples, from writers both sacred and profane.

It may not be amiss here to suggest, that as participles so often put on the nature of mere adjectives, and generally have so much resemblance to them, so the construction of them with or without an article, almost *ad libitum scriptoris*, may serve to cast light on the case of adjectives that are anarthrous, when put before or after a noun that has the article; a subject that has been discussed under the preceding head. So far as analogy goes in this case, it seems to be against the theory of Matthiae and Bottmann.

(c) We come now to another species of adjuncts, which are very often employed to qualify or modify some principal noun in a sentence. I refer to adjuncts made by means of nouns with prepositions, the *sense* of which may be regarded as equivalent to that of an adjective. For example; when Paul says, *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* the clause *ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* qualifies *πίστις* and specificates its particular nature. It serves the purpose, therefore, of an adjective. And in this respect, the versatility of the Greek language is truly wonderful. It abounds, indeed, in proper adjectives. But numerous as these are, still they do not by any means reach all the wants of the speaker or writer. In the case cited, for example, what is the adjective that would express the same relation? *Δία* would not, for this means simply *divine*, qualifying the nature of a thing or person, and not expressing the object towards which the affections or feelings of such a person are directed. To *θεία* the same objection may be made. Of course the qualification which the apostle designed to express, must be expressed in the manner he has chosen.

The example adduced serves to illustrate the nature of the case which we now have under consideration. Let us see how the article is treated in cases of this description.

It is a very common and indeed the general fact, that where the principal noun has the article, the article is also prefixed to a subordinate clause which qualifies it. Examples are every where to be found; *τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους*, 2 Cor. 8: 4; *ταῖς φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*, James 1: 1; *τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνων*, Acts 15: 23; *τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστιᾳ*, Rom. 4: 11; and so on, in a multitude of cases. But cases also occur where the usage is different, the second article being omitted. For example; *τῶν συγγενῶν κατὰ σάρκα*, Rom. 9: 3; *τὸν... ζῆλον ὑπὲρ ἑμοῦ*, 2 Cor. 7: 7; *τὴν πίστιν... ἐν Χριστῷ*, Col. 1: 4; *τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί*, Eph. 2: 11; *τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα*,

1 Cor. 10 : 18 ; τὴν ἀλλοτριώτητα πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, Polyb. 3. 48. 11. It will not be asserted, I trust, that there is any notable difference of sense between the two diverse modes of constructing adjuncts of this nature, i. e. of constructing them with and without the article. Then, of course, the insertion or omission of the article, in these cases, must have depended much on the will of the writer.

(d) As kindred to this last head, we may produce the case where the principal noun omits the article. Here usage varies again. The rule, we may say, is, that when the principal noun omits the article, the subordinate adjunct also omits it ; e. g. εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας, 1 Tim. 4 : 3 ; ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρῆς καρδίας, 1 Tim. 1 : 5 ; χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Rom. 14 : 17 ; and so very frequently, both in sacred and profane authors.

On the other hand, the adjunct sometimes takes the article, when the principal noun omits it ; as πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ, Acts 26 : 18 ; ἀγαπῇ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ, 2 Tim. 1 : 13 ; ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, Tit. 3 : 5. A flood of examples is produced of this nature, by Winer in § 19, 4 of his Grammar.

(e) One more qualification or limitation of a principal noun by a subordinate one, remains to be considered. This is the case where the principal noun has a genitive case simply connected with it ; as ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, or λόγος θεοῦ. The rule here, as laid down by grammarians, is, that *where the principal noun has the article, the subordinate one must have it ; and where the first omits it, the last rejects it ;* i. e. both must have, or both reject, the article. But one need not read far in any Greek author without finding this rule frequently violated. Thus in Luke 8 : 7, ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν ; and so ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου, Luke 8 : 14 ; ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς, Luke 8 : 41 ; λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου, Phil. 2 : 25 ; and thus in a multitude of cases. I am aware that it has been said, that the article is left out in the principal word in such cases, because of some other rule or principle which would justify the omission. It may be true, I grant, that the omission can be justified, in the cases adduced and in others of the like nature ; but is it *demanded* ? and especially, is it demanded in opposition to the canon which we are now contemplating, and which is often laid down with little abatement and exception ? Middleton says, he is ‘not aware that any Greek prose writer, except the florid Philo Judæus, disregards this canon.’ (p. 30.) But what would he say to the following sentence from Xenophon : συνέκαλεσε καὶ ἱππέων καὶ πεζῶν καὶ

ἀρμάτων τοῦς ἡγεμόνας? Cyrop. 6. 3. 8. And what can be said to such examples as these? viz. *περὶ καταλύσεως τῆς στρατιᾶς*, Xen. Cyrop. 6. 1. 13; *ἐν καταλύσει τοῦ βίου*, Apol. Soc. 30; *ἐπὶ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου*, Mem. 1. 5. 2; *ὑπὸ μήκους τῶν ὁδῶν*, Strab. xv. p. 719; *δυσχέρεια τοῦ νοσήματος*, Soph. Philoct. 888; et sæpe eodem modo alibi.

In general it must be philosophically true, that where the principal noun is specific, some quality or circumstance marked by a following genitive will of course be specific. But there are cases where the writer does not mean to make specificness, either as it respects the principal noun, or else in regard to the subordinate one. In such cases, he accomplishes his design by omitting the article before either, as circumstances may require.

We have now gone through with the classes of words usually added to modify, limit, and qualify the principal nouns, in any sentence; and we have seen, that there is scarcely a single rule in regard to the use of the article, that does not admit of exceptions, many or most of which seem to depend more on the design of the writer, than on the absolute nature of the things concerned.

There is still remaining, however, one or two cases in respect to the insertion or omission of the article, which have been the subject of much dispute, and which, from the importance thus given to them, should not pass unnoticed.

6. Several nouns standing in the same case, and being connected by a conjunction, take each the article when the gender of them is diverse.

Such is the general principle. As examples may be adduced, *ταὺς σεβόμενας γυναῖκας*... *καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως*, Acts 13: 50; *ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ*, Col. 2: 13; *τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα*... *παρέχεσθε*, Col. 4: 1; *ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου*, Rom. 8: 2. This principle is common, moreover, to classic Greek, as well as to the New Testament.

Yet imperious as this law may seem to be, even from the nature of the case and the importance of being perspicuous, it is still far from being universal. E. g. *τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, Col. 2: 22; *ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φράγμους*, Luke 14: 23; *τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον*, Rev. 5: 12; *ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιομασι*, Luke 1: 6; *οἱ γνωστοὶ*... *καὶ γυναῖκες*, Luke 23: 49. So in the classic writers; *τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ λόγῳ*, Plat. Repub. ix. p. 586; *οἱ παῖδες τε καὶ γυναῖκες*, ib. p. 557; *ὁ σωφρονὼν καὶ σωφρονοῦσα*, Plat. Leg. vi. p. 784; *ταῖς δυνάμει*

καὶ πόλεμον, Agath. xiv. 12; and so not unfrequently in other writers.

Whatever now may be said of the insertion of the article before each noun, in cases of such a nature, the omission of it must surely be *ad arbitrium scriptoris*. Let the student note here, as we shall have occasion in the sequel to appeal to this head of illustration, that when the second noun is clearly and altogether discrepant from the preceding one, both as to gender and meaning, it still may, and not unfrequently does, omit the article.

7. Several nouns connected by a conjunction, and being in the same case and of the same gender, usually omit the article after it has been once inserted, viz. before the first noun.

E. g. μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων, Mark 15: 1; διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης, Col. 2: 8; ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ, Phil. 2: 17; and thus in a multitude of cases, both in sacred and profane authors. The case extends to adjectives and participles connected in the like way, as well as to nouns; e. g. τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον, Acts 3: 14; τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανή, Acts 2: 20; οἱ . . . λατρεύοντες καὶ καυχώμενοι . . . καὶ . . . πεποιθότες, Phil. 3: 3; ὁ μαρτυρῶν . . . καὶ γράψας, John 21: 14.

Yet the number of cases is almost equally great, where the article is inserted before the second noun, etc. as well as the first; e. g. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται, John 19: 6; τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι, Luke 8: 24; τοῦ ποιητοῦ καὶ τοῦ πίνακος, Luke 11: 39. The reader may find a multitude of the like cases, both in sacred and profane writers, collected by Winer in his Grammar, §. 18. 5.

The general principle that seems to predominate through cases of such a nature as those in Nos. 6, 7, appears to be this, viz. that where the several things enumerated belong, either actually or as viewed by the writer, to one and the same class or genus, the article may be omitted after the first noun; but if they are distinct, and are intended to be distinctly and separately represented, then the article is inserted or omitted (as the case may be) before them all. Yet this last rule, which would seem to be almost imperious for the sake of perspicuity, is often, very often, neglected. Thus, for example, οὐ . . . οἱ πλατεῖς οὐδ' εὐρύντοιοι, Soph. Ajax, 649, where οὐδέ renders the distinction certain; λόγῳ μὲν ἐσθλα, τοῖσι δ' ἔργοισιν κακά, Soph. Oedip. Col. 782; εἶπον καὶ σοφοῖς καὶ τοῖσι φαύλοις ἐνδικας, Aesch. Phoen. 509; ἢ διὰ τῆς ὀψεως καὶ δι' ἀκοῆς ἡδονή, Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 302. So also with participles; e. g. τῷ τοὺς λόγους λέγοντι καὶ τιμωμέ-

rog, Eurip. Orest. 913. The same with adjectives; e. g. τὰ ὅσια καὶ μὴ, Plat. Eutyph. p. 9; the contrary of which is elsewhere exhibited, as τὰ τε εὐσεβῆ καὶ ὅσια καὶ τὰ μὴ, ib. p. 12; ὅσιον καὶ τὸ δίκαιον, Eurip. El. 1351; ἐσθλὰ τε καὶ τὰ χεῖρα, Hom. Odyss. α', 229. More examples the reader may see in Matthiae, § 268. Ann. 1.

I have now exhibited all the very important cases, in which the article is either inserted or omitted. I must merely advert, in the briefest manner I can, to other cases in which the insertion and omission seems to be, in some good degree, *ad arbitrium auctoris*.

8. I shall arrange these under different heads for the sake of perspicuity and convenience.

(a) Verbs *substantive* and *nuncupative*, i. e. verbs of existence and of naming, usually have anarthrous nouns after them. Yet here exceptions are numerous. For verbs substantive, see No. 3 above; of verbs nuncupative, the following are examples, viz. τὸ ὄνομα... λέγεται ὁ ἄψινθος, Apoc. 8: 11; καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα... ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, Apoc. 19: 13; so also ἀνακαλοῦντες τὸν εὐεργέτην τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀγαθόν, Xen. Cyrop. 3. 3. 4; τὸν ἀξιόπαιον, ἀνακαλοῦντες τὸν προδότην, Anab. 6. 6. 7. See Matt. Gramm. § 268, and Winer, Gramm. § 17. 6.

(b) *Τειοῦτος*, joined with a noun, admits or rejects the article; 2 Cor. 12: 2, 3. John 4: 23. Matt. 9: 8. Mark 6: 2.

(c) Numeral adjectives, which of course are *definite*, may take or omit the article; e. g. Matt. 16: 21. 17: 23. Mark 9: 31. 15: 25. Acts 2: 15.

(d) Pronouns possessive often take, and often omit, the article; Matt. 18: 20. Mark 8: 38. John 4: 34 (in the predicate.) In the New Testament the cases of omitting the article are rare, when the pronominal adjectives are used, but frequent when the pronoun itself is employed in their stead; comp. under No. 2 above. Matthiae produces a flood of examples where the article is inserted, and others where it is omitted, when pronominal adjectives are employed, § 264. 4. Vol. II. p. 543.

(e) With demonstrative pronouns the article is often joined, and not unfrequently omitted, because they are of themselves sufficiently specific. See Matt. § 265. 1.

(f) Even *ἐκαστος*, which one would naturally take to be indefinite, not unfrequently admits the article, although it is generally without it; Matt. § 265. 5.

But I need not pursue the subject any further. Enough, I trust has been said, to show how little is to be thought of confi-

dent and positive declarations, in a multitude of cases, respecting the insertion or omission of the article ; enough to show, how little claim a great part of Middleton's canons have, to the universality which he has generally given to them, and to the impetuous nature with which he has often invested them.

I should fail, after all, of the great object that I have had in view, or at least I should be exposed to misinterpretation, if I should stop here, without making some reflections, and subjoining some cautions, in relation to what has already been exhibited. The reader will therefore, as I hope, indulge me with the liberty of adding such remarks as I deem of importance to the accomplishment of my design.

First, I would caution him against supposing, that it is in all cases a matter of indifference whether the article is inserted or omitted. Nothing can be more certain, than that the article often changes the relation of some words, and that they are definite or indefinite, according to the insertion or omission of it. But still, it is equally true, that where this definiteness or indefiniteness is not a main or an important object, in the view of a writer or speaker, he of course is at liberty to insert or omit the article, in cases where it is grammatically admissible or omissible. And where, we may now ask, is it not so? We have been the whole round of examples or cases, in which the article is employed, and we have not found a single rule that is without exceptions; unless we regard the rule respecting the adjective as being so. There is no case which in itself is so imperious, that it may not at times be disregarded. But this must not be misinterpreted. I do not mean to say, that the insertion or omission of the article, in many cases, would be equally proper. Most certainly not. Its insertion, for example, before participles, where the practice varies so much, would in some cases give a false emphasis to the participle and elevate it too much into notice. In other cases, this elevation is a specific object with the writer, and therefore the article is demanded.

In many cases the *relative* meaning of words is entirely changed by the presence or absence of the article ; e. g. ἄλλοι *others*, indefinite, i. e. any others ; but οἱ ἄλλοι *the others, the rest*, in case of some definite division into parts. So πολλοί *many*, indefinitely ; but οἱ πολλοί means either *the greater number* in any particular case, or else *the great mass* of the community. And thus it is with a multitude of other words. The presence

of the article indicates of course a definiteness or specificness of relation.

Beyond all question, moreover, the well cultivated mind of a native Greek would often be susceptible of a feeling of propriety or impropriety, with regard to the admission or exclusion of the article, to which we can at present make no claims. Every language that employs the article has some niceties in respect to it, which belong to no other language. We have already seen, that no two languages agree in all respects with regard to its use. This fact alone would serve to show, that there must be something *schwankend*, as the Germans say, i. e. variable, not steadfast and uniform, in regard to the nature of the thing itself. The definite article must of course be for substance the same in all languages. Yet the custom of making this or that object definite or specific, i. e. of conceiving of it and representing it as such, appears to be quite different. We say: *Nature* does this. The Greek would say: τοῦτο ποιεῖ ἡ φύσις, or τοῦτο ποιεῖ φύσις. The French would attach the article to *Nature* in this case; so also the Germans. In English the *omission* is indispensable, in a proposition of the kind before us; in French the *insertion* is indispensable; in Greek the speaker has his choice, for if φύσις be viewed as an abstract or concrete noun, it is monadic, and the article may therefore be inserted or omitted. Φύσις used in the way of personification, would of course naturally claim the article.

The number of cases in which the Greek inserts the article, where we omit it in English, is almost beyond computation. Yet our *the* is like the Greek ὁ and answers the very same purpose, where the use is common to both languages. This simple fact is enough to show, that much which respects the article, must be arbitrary, i. e. must depend not on the nature itself of this part of speech, but on the particular usages of each language in which it is employed.

Nay, we may without any hazard venture farther than this. Not only do different languages vary in their use of the definite article, but different individuals who use the same language vary not a little from each other. Thus the four Evangelists almost always say, ὁ Χριστός; while Paul and Peter generally say, Χριστός simply, unless the word is in the genitive after another word which has the article. Both usages are abundantly sanctioned by the laws of classic Greek.

Nor need we confine ourselves to the New Testament for ex-

amples. We have already seen, that the contest has not yet ceased among the very first class of Greek scholars, whether Homer employs the proper article at all. For substance likewise, the same question is pending in regard to Hesiod. Then we may come to the Greek tragedians, whose measured, lofty, polished style is designed to exhibit the very perfection of the Greek language. And truly, I can form no conception of polish in language, beyond that which Sophocles exhibits. Yet here, the article, as all agree, is seldom employed; I mean, seldom in comparison with its frequency in Plato, Xenophon, Thucydides, etc. How can such facts as these exist, and to such a wide extent, and yet a question be made whether the article may not be omitted by one writer, in a multitude of cases where another inserts it?

This, after all, does not prove, nor is it alleged to prove, that it was in all cases a matter of indifference whether the article was inserted or omitted. In a multitude of cases, to say the least, the insertion of it would give a new turn to the sense of the word which should receive it. In others, the omission would also occasion the loss of specification and emphasis.

But still, this note of specification may be dispensed with in a multitude of cases, on the very ground that nouns are already either specific in themselves, or are made so by adjuncts attached to them. There is yet another class of cases by no means inconsiderable, in which the omission or insertion of the article depends entirely on the subjective feelings and views of the writer or speaker, and not at all on the nature of the things which he describes or asserts. We must not confound all these cases together. There is great need of patient examination in order to ascertain to which of these categories a thing belongs, before we pronounce any sentence in respect to the article that might or might not accompany it. Here is one of those cases, in which *διαγινώσκουσιν τὰ διαφέροντα* seems to be altogether indispensable.

I purposely omit the details concerning the article when it is used as a pronoun demonstrative or relative; for both of these uses it has, as every good lexicon and grammar will shew. Its insertion or omission in such cases, must depend on the same laws that govern pronouns of the like nature.

That many interpreters and lexicographers have represented the article *ὁ* as being sometimes *indefinite*, like our English article *a*, seems singular. How can a part of speech the very ob-

ject of which is to mark *definiteness*, or at least to *specify* in some respect or other, at the same time be the sign of *indefiniteness*? The ground of mistake, however, in this case, may easily be pointed out. Critics who have avowed such a principle, do not seem to have sufficiently reflected, that the usages in respect to the definite article are variable in different languages. What the French or the Germans often express definitely, i. e. with the article, the English often express indefinitely. But this does not make the French or German definite article to possess an indefinite nature. By no means. It only shows that the mode of expressing the same thing may, to a certain extent, vary among different nations. If I say: *Evil has evil consequences*, I mean to convey the idea, that whatever is evil will be followed by bad consequences. But if I say, *The evil (τὸ κακόν) has evil consequences*, I express, indeed, the very same general idea; but at the same time I naturally indicate, by this mode of expression, that the word *evil* is here viewed in opposition to good, which has already been mentioned or is distinctly an object that was naturally supposed to be before the mind. Nothing can be more incorrect, then, than to prescribe laws for the use of the Greek article from the usages of the German or English tongue. Nor can it be consonant with sound criticism to aver, that because a word which has the Greek article before it, must be rendered into one of these languages with the omission of the article, that therefore the article is in its own nature indefinite.

I have proceeded as far in the developement of this subject, as the patience of my readers will permit. I shall conclude the whole by exhibiting a few contested cases in respect to the insertion or omission of the article, which have an important bearing on some of the great doctrines of theology.

So long ago as the former part of the third century, Origen intimated that in John 1: 1, θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, the writer did not say ὁ θεός because this would designate the supreme God. Often has this been appealed to, in order to show, that only a θεῦ-ρατος θεός is meant by the declaration of the Evangelist; for if more had been meant, the presence of the article, it has been asserted, would have been necessary.

How obviously incorrect it is, to build such a theory on the absence of the article in this case, is sufficiently plain by a comparison of the cases which occur in the very chapter that contains the expression before us. For example; v. 6, "There was a man sent παρὰ θεοῦ; v. 12, τέκνα θεοῦ; v. 18, ἐκ θεοῦ;

v. 18, "No man hath seen *θεόν*, at any time." In these, and in a multitude of other cases, there is no doubt whether the supreme God is designated, and yet the article is *omitted*.

On the other hand, if the writer had said, *ὁ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, it would have rendered it doubtful here, whether *ὁ λόγος* or *ὁ θεός* was the *subject* of his proposition. Or if *ὁ λόγος* were to be taken as the subject, then the assertion would be, that *the Logos is THE God*; an assertion which the writer did not mean to make, for this would exclude the Father and the Spirit from being truly divine, or else make them one and the same in all respects with the Logos. Nor is the assertion of the Evangelist to be taken as meaning that the Logos is *a God* merely; but that he is *God*, i. e. that he is divine, that he possesses a divine nature. This is all that is required; and all, indeed, that the nature of the proposition admits.

The passage in Tit. 2 : 13, "*Looking for the blessed hope καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*," has been the subject of long, learned, and animated contest. One party avers, that the absence of the article before *σωτῆρος* necessarily unites it to *θεοῦ* and makes it predicable of the same being. Mr Wordsworth has shewn, in his treatise respecting this form of expression, that the Greek Fathers generally understood this passage in such a way; Middleton says he has shewn, that "all antiquity were agreed on this question," p. 307. This may be so. But if it be, there still remains a doubt whether they were guided by *theological* or *philological* reasons, in forming this opinion, so far as the *article* is concerned. Nothing can be plainer, indeed, than that a Greek would naturally say, *τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος*, if he meant to predicate both appellations of the same person. But if the reader will now turn back to No. 7, he will see that nothing can be plainer, also, than that a Greek might have used the same expression, in case different persons were intended to be designated. When two nouns are of the same gender and in the same case, this is reason enough for omitting the article before the second, if the writer pleases; and this, whether they both relate, or not, to the same individual. Middleton says: "It is impossible to understand *θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος* otherwise than of one person," p. 307. The reader by re-examining No. 7, can judge how little ground there is to assert this, so far as the absence of the article is concerned; and it is in reference to this, that Middleton makes the assertion. But in addition to this, there is another reason which may be

given for the omission of the article ; and this is, that the pronoun *ἡμῶν* of itself specificates *σωτήρος*, and therefore renders the insertion of the article unnecessary, even in case the writer meant that *σωτήρος* should be considered as distinct from *τοῦ θεοῦ*. The reader has only to look back upon No. 2 above, in order to become fully persuaded concerning this obvious principle with regard to the Greek article.

On two accounts, then, the absence of the article in this case cannot prove any thing important ; for, as we have seen, it might be dispensed with, whether the writer meant to put *σωτήρος* in apposition with *θεοῦ*, or to designate a different person by it (compare No. 4 above) ; or it may have been omitted because of the pronoun *ἡμῶν* which of itself specifies. It would seem, therefore, that there was no good ground for the great contest which has existed in this case, in respect to the presence or absence of the article. If the writer designed to make *σωτήρος* merely an explicative or attributive of *θεοῦ* in this case, he would, beyond all doubt, have expressed himself as he now has ; but if he did not design this, but meant to make the usual distinction so often made in Paul's epistles, between God the Father and Christ, he might still have used the same expression. The whole argument then, on either side, so far as the *article* is concerned, falls to the ground.

Not so however, in my apprehension, in regard to considerations deducible from the context. Where in the New Testament, is the *ἐπιφάνεια* of God the Father asserted or foretold ? It is Christ who is to appear " in the clouds of heaven, with great power and glory." It is "*the Lord* himself who is to come with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God ;" it is " he who shall come with the clouds, whom every eye shall see, and *they also who pierced him*." It is he then *who was pierced*, that is to make the *ἐπιφάνεια* on earth. I know of no New Testament analogy for any other than he, who is to make such a development of himself. How can I then refer this *ἐπιφάνεια* in Tit. 2 : 13 to God the Father ? Reasoning *a priori*, or party views, might lead me to do so ; but the analogy of the New Testament throughout, would forbid me to do it.

On other and very different grounds, then, than that of the presence or absence of the article in this case, I arrive at the full persuasion, that *τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος*, are both appellatives applied in this case to *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. If I am

pressed with the question: Where is any thing like this in all the New Testament? My answer would be, that καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, John 1:1; ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Rom. 9:5; ἐσμέν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός καὶ ὁ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, 1 John 5:20; are altogether analogical. In this last case, I would not rely so much on the grammatical connexion of οὗτός with Χριστῷ as its antecedent, as I would on the attributive ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Who is appropriately so called by the apostle John, except Jesus? Let the reader compare John 1:4. 5:26, 11:25. 6:35. 14:6. 1 John 5:11, 12. Thus is Christ called ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς in 1 John 1:1; and in 1:2 he is not only called ζωὴ but ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος, the very appellation given him at the close of the epistle. If now any writer may be permitted to explain himself, I should think John had done so in the case before us. Consequently I find in him and in Paul, analogies for a case like that of τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος, . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. But, as will be seen, I do not trust the Greek article as being the despositary of arguments, in a case of such magnitude as this. In almost all cases it must be a slender support for any conclusion; but here especially it is not worthy of the trust which so many have reposed in it.

In the same manner as Tit. 2:13, may the case be solved which occurs in Jude, v. 4, viz. τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. Whether τὸν δεσπότην and κύριον both apply to Χριστόν, cannot be decided by the absence of the article before κύριος. To give the reasons specifically, would be merely to repeat what has just been said. Ἡμῶν of itself specificates κύριον, and the article might therefore be omitted, even if the writer meant that δεσπότην and κύριον should be taken separately; and it would almost of course be omitted, if he meant that both should be merely attributives of Χριστός. Consequently nothing can be made out of the absence of the article, which is satisfactory. The word ἀρνούμενοι, however, gives us a clue, as it seems to me, by which we may arrive at the true sense. The New Testament is full of the idiom which applies the word *deny* to the rejection of Christ; e. g. Thou shalt *deny* me thrice, Matt. 26:34, 35. Mark 14:30, 31, 72. Matt. 10:33. 2 Tim. 2:12. Luke 12:9. John 13:18. Acts 3:13, 14. Rev. 13:8, and often elsewhere. Once only in the New Testament do I find the word *deny* applied as designating the rejection of God simply; and even here the mode of expression is

peculiar : "They profess to know God, but in works they deny him," Tit. 1: 15. When I compare, therefore, the expression in Jude v. 4, with the texts above named, and in particular with 2 Pet. 2: 1, *deny the Lord that bought them*; and also with 1 John 2: 22, 23, I cannot hesitate to believe, that τὸν μόνον θεοπότην καὶ κύριον do both refer to Ἰ. Χριστόν. Nothing can be more characteristic of Paul's mode of representing Christ, than this mode which presents him as the reigning Lord of the universe.

The case in 2 Thess. 2: 12 appears to me to be of a different nature. Here we have τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰ. Χριστοῦ. But in a connexion of this nature and in phraseology like this, we often find θεός unequivocally distinguished from κύριος; e. g. 2 Thess. 1: 2, Χάρις... ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ κυρίου Ἰ. Χριστοῦ; comp. 1 Thess. 1: 1. Col. 1: 2 (Text. Recep.) Phil. 1: 2. Eph. 1: 2, etc. Yet this text (2 Thess. 2: 12) has been adduced by Granville Sharp and others, as a proof text for the doctrine of the Trinity, on the ground that the want of the Greek article before κυρίου must necessarily attach κυρίου to θεοῦ. In this case then, if such a conclusion is legitimate, it would follow that πατρὸς ἡμῶν is also an appellative of Ἰ. Χριστός; but where in all the New Testament is there any analogy for this?

On the other hand, the case in 2 Pet. 3: 18 is very clearly of the opposite character. Here we have, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χριστοῦ. That καὶ σωτῆρος is an attributive or explicative of κυρίου, and that both belong to Χριστοῦ, there can hardly be any room for doubt. Both are the familiar and usual appellations of Christ; and they are often united together elsewhere, as well as here; e. g. Tit. 1: 4. 2 Pet. 1: 11. 2: 20. 3: 2, al.

But my limits compel me to desist from more examples. Those on which most stress has been laid, and which have been the subjects of the longest and sharpest contests, have been already adduced. Should I go beyond these bounds, I should not know where to stop. The exemplification of principles laid down in the preceding essay, may be found, of course, on every page of the New Testament. Most readers, tolerably familiar with Greek, will, as I trust, be able to put them to the test. At all events, I must think that these principles are at least more intelligible and more firmly supported, than those of Middleton.

I have read his book until I despair of getting to the light; so often does he deal in the *claro-obscure*, and so often utters unguarded assertions, at least such as are incapable of solid defence.

Passow has some good remarks in his *Lexicon*, respecting the article; and so has Bretschneider, who seems to have laid out some effort upon this part of speech. Wahl has endless subdivision, seemingly without any steadfast principles under which he attempted to arrange his facts. Buttmann, in his *Grammar*, has only a few hints; Rost has made a very brief but a striking digest of general principles. Matthiae alone seems to have made the subject one of attentive, deep, and thorough study; and he has more facts respecting it, than all the others put together. Winer seems to have fully and thoroughly studied and comprehended him; but he has not taken the requisite pains to classify the subject in general. The parts of it that he has exhibited, are done in his best manner.

I make these remarks merely for the sake of readers, who may wish to study the subject, and not for the sake of indulging in criticism on the efforts of others, which is far enough from being the particular design of this essay. The reader who has not leisure or opportunity to read all which has been written on the Greek article, will naturally wish to be informed where he may read to the best advantage. I have ventured, in the above remarks, to give him my views respecting this question.

‘But—*mutato nomine de te fabula narratur*; the next writer that rises up, may find as many faults with your theory, as you have with other theories.’ So methinks I hear some of my readers say. Be it so, is my reply. I have but one wish respecting the subject; and this is, to come at what is true, if there be any such thing as finding it. If my remarks should excite some one to correct my errors, and to throw more light on this subject, so long neglected, and so little understood by most Greek readers, I shall be among the foremost to tender him my congratulations and my most cheerful approbation.

In the mean time, it is not amiss to give a hint to theologians and critics, that important conclusions in either of their departments ought not to be built on the presence or absence of the article, until the metes and bounds of this part of speech are much more definitely settled, and better understood. Nothing can be more certain, than that a large extent of the ground is arbitrary, at least it is in a great measure so; and the limits to

which it is so, remain to be fixed more definitely, before we can say—*ultra quos nequit consistere rectum*. Our faith, then, in matters of belief or exegesis, should not, for the present, have for its basis this "*loquacissimae gentis flabellum*." The context, the idiom in general, and the nature of the case, are always, and ever must be, better guides. Them let us follow ; at least until our new guide attains to a character more fixed, more uniform, and more trust-worthy than it has at present.

ART. IV. HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE SLAVIC LANGUAGE IN
ITS VARIOUS DIALECTS; WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

By Mrs. E. Robinson
Original.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

THE following article has been prepared for this work with great care, and with a diligent use of all the sources accessible to a writer in this country ; some of which indeed are here accessible only to the writer, who has likewise been for several years conversant with the subject in another country under more favourable auspices. It is here inserted for two principal reasons. The first is the intrinsic interest and importance of the subject itself ; relating as it does to the language and literature of a population amounting at present to nearly sixty millions, or more than four times as great as that of the whole of these United States. These topics embrace of course the history of mental cultivation among the Slavic nations, their intellectual developement, the progress of man among them as a thinking, sentient, social being, acting and acted upon in his various relations to other minds. It is also a matter of no small interest, to observe the influence which Christianity has exercised upon the language and literature of these tribes. It was to the introduction and progress of Christianity that these nations owe their written language ; and to the versions of the Scriptures they owe not only their moral and religious cultivation, but also the cultivation and in a great degree the existence of their national literature." The same influence Christianity is now exercising upon the Indian languages of our own country and of the Pacific ; and with the prospect of results still more propitious. Indeed, wherever we learn the fact, that a language hitherto regarded as barbarous and existing only as oral, has been reclaimed and reduced to writing, and made the vehicle of communicating fixed thought and permanent instruction, there it has ever been CHRISTIANITY and MISSIONARY ENTERPRIZE, which has produced these results.

A second reason for the insertion of the present article, is the circumstance, that the information here given is no where else accessible to the English reader. It is true, that the literature of some of the Slavic nations, e. g. of the Russians, Poles, Bohemians,

etc. is treated of under the proper heads in the German *Conversations-Lexicon*; and that these articles have been translated and incorporated into the *Encyclopædia Americana*. The Foreign Quarterly Review, also, has occasionally articles of value on these topics. Dr Bowring, in the preface to some of his specimens of Slavic poetry, has given short notices on the same subject. The biblical literature of the Old Slavic and Russian has been well exhibited by Dr Henderson. But still, all these are only imperfect sketches of the separate *parts* of one great whole; of which in its full extent, both as a whole and in the intimate connexion of its parts, no general view exists in the English language.—EDITOR.

HISTORICAL VIEW, ETC.

THE earliest history of the Slavic nations is involved in a darkness, which all the investigations of diligent and sagacious modern historians and philologists have not been able to clear up. The striking analogy between their language and the Sanscrit, indicates their origin from India; but to ascertain the time, at which they first entered Europe, seems now no longer possible. Probably this event took place seven or eight centuries before the Christian era, on account of the over-population of the regions on the Ganges.¹ Herodotus mentions a people which he called Krovzyi, who lived on the Ister. There is even now a tribe in Russia, whose name at least is almost the same.² Strabo, Pomponius Mela, Pliny, Tacitus, and several other classical and a few oriental writers allude to the Slavic nations occasionally. But the first distinct intelligence we have of them, is not older than the middle of the sixth century.³ At this period we

¹ See Schlegel's *Sprache and Weisheit der Indier*, Heidelb. 1808. Von Hammer's *Fundgruben des Orients*, Vol. II. p. 459 sq. Murray's *History of the European Languages*, Edinb. 1823. Frenzel, who wrote at the close of the seventh century, took the Slavi for a Hebrew tribe and their language for Hebrew. Some modern German and Italian historians derive the Slavic language from the Thracian, and the Slavi immediately from Japhet; some consider the ancient Scythians as Slavi. See Dobrovsky's *Slovanka*, VII. p. 94.

² *Krivitshi*. The Greek is Κροβύζοι, Herodot. IV. 49. Comp. Strabo VII. p. 318, 319. Plin. H. N. IV. 12.

³ The first writers, who mention the Slavi expressly, are Jordan or Jornandes, after A. D. 552, Procopius A. D. 562, Menander A. D. 594, and the Abbot John of Biclar before A. D. 620. See Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Slavischen Sprache und Literatur*, Buda 1826. Dobrovsky's *Slovanka*, V. p. 76—84.

see them traversing the Danube in large multitudes, and settling on both the banks of that river. From that time they appear frequently in the accounts of the Byzantine historians, under the different appellations of the Slavi, Sarmatae, Antae, Vandales, Veneti and Vendes, mostly involved in the wars of the two Roman Empires, sometimes as allies, sometimes as conquerors; oftener, notwithstanding their acknowledged valour and courage, as vassals; but mostly as emigrants and colonists, thrust out of their own countries by the pressing forward of the more warlike German or Teutonic tribes. Only the first of the above mentioned names is decidedly of Slavic origin; ⁴ the second is ambiguous; and the four last are later and purely geographical, having been transferred to Slavic nations from those who occupied formerly the territory, where the Romans first became acquainted with them.

It results from the very nature of this information, that we cannot expect to get from it any satisfactory knowledge of their political state or the degree of their civilization. In general, they appear as a peaceful, industrious, hospitable people, obedient to their chiefs, and religious in their habits. Wherever they established themselves, they began to cultivate the earth, and to trade in the productions of the country. There are also early

⁴ The name of the Slavi has generally been derived from *slava*, glory, and their national feelings have of course been gratified by this derivation. But the more immediate origin of their appellation, is to be sought in the word *slavo*, word, speech. The change of *o* into *s* occurs frequently in the Slavic languages, (thus *slava* comes from *slavo*;) but is in this case probably to be ascribed to foreigners, viz. Byzantines, Romans, and Germans. In the language of the latter, the *o* in names and words of Slavic origin in many instances becomes *a*. The radical syllable *slov* is yet to be found in the appellations which the majority of the Slavic nations apply to themselves or kindred nations, e. g. Slovenzi, Slovaci, Slovane, Sloveni, etc. The Russians and Servians did not exchange the *o* for *a* before the seventh century. See Schaffarik's *Geschichte*, etc. p. 5. n. 6. The same writer observes p. 287. n. 8, "It is remarkable that, while all the other Slavic nations relinquished their original *national* names, and adopted *specific* names, as Russians, Poles, Silesians, Tchekes, Moravians, Sorabians, Servians, Morlachians, Tchernogortzi, Bulgarians, etc. nay, when most of them imitating foreigners altered the general name *Slovene* into *Slavene*, only those two Slavic branches, which touch each other on the banks of the Danube, the *Slovaks* and the *Slovenzi*, have retained in its purity their original national name."

traces of their fondness for music and poetry ; and some circumstances, of which we shall speak in the sequel, seem to justify the supposition of a very early cultivation of the language.

All the knowledge we have respecting the ancient history of the Slavic race, as we have seen, is gathered from foreign authors ; the earliest of their own historians did not write before the second half of the eleventh century.⁵ At this time the Slavic nations were already in possession, partly as masters, partly as servants, of the whole vast extent of territory, which they now occupy ; and if we assume that at the present time about fifty or sixty millions speak the Slavic language, in its different dialects, we must calculate that at the above mentioned period, and in the course of the next following centuries, before the Slavic was by degrees supplanted in the German-Slavic provinces by the German idiom, the number of those who called that language their mother tongue was at least the fourth part greater. Schloetzer observes that, with the exception of the Arabians, who once domineered from Malacca to Lisbon, no nation on the globe had extended themselves so far. In the South the Adriatic, the range of the Balkan, and the Euxine, are their frontiers ; the coasts of the Icy Ocean are their limits in the North ; their still greater extent in an Eastern and Western direction reaches from Kamtschatka and the Russian islands of the Pacific, where many of their vestiges are to be found among scattered tribes, as far as to the Baltic and along the banks of the rivers Elbe, Muhr and Raab, again to the Adriatic. It is this immense extent, which adds considerably to the difficulties of a general survey of the different relations and connexions of nations, broken up into so many parts. The *history of the language* is our object, not the history of the people ; we therefore give of statistic and political notices only so much, as seems to be requisite for the illustration of our subject.

The earliest data for the history of the civilization of the Slavic race, we find in their mythology ; and here their oriental origin again appears. The antithesis of a good and evil principle is met with among most of their tribes ; and as even at the present time in some Slavic dialects everything good, beautiful, praiseworthy, is to them synonymous with the purity of the white colour, they call the good Spirit *Bielo Bôg*, the white god ; the

⁵ The earliest Slavic historian is the Russian monk Nestor, born in the year 1056. See below, in the History of the *Old Slavic* and of the *Russian* languages.

evil Spirit *Tcherno Bôg*, the black god. The *Dio* of the old Russians seems to be likewise akin to the *Dev* of the Hindoo; the goddess of life, *Shiva*, of the Polabae, to the Indian *Shiva*; as the names of the Slavic personification of death, *Morjana*, *Morena*, *Marzana*, evidently stand in connexion with the Indian word for death, *Marana*. Strabo describes some of the idols of the Rugians, in which we meet again the whole significant symbolization of the East. The custom prevalent among many Slavic nations, of females burning themselves with the corpses of their husbands, seems also to have been brought from India to Europe.

There are however other features of their mythology which belong to them exclusively, and which remind us rather of the sprightly and poetical imagination of the Greeks. We allude to their mode of attributing life to the inanimate objects of nature, rocks, brooks and trees; of peopling with supernatural beings the woods which surrounded them, the mountains between which they lived. The *Rusalki* of the Russians, the *Vila* of the southern Slavic nations, the *Leshie* of several other tribes, nymphs, naiads, and satyrs, are still to be found in many popular tales and songs. If, however, we have compared them to the poetical gods of the Greeks, we must not forget to add, that their character has less resemblance to these gods, who indeed appear only as ordinary men, with higher powers, more violent passions, and less limited lives, than it has to the northern Elf, and the German Nix and mountain Spirit—without heart and soul themselves, but always intermeddling with intrusive curiosity in human affairs, however void of real interest in them; revengeful towards the most trifling offence or the least neglect, and beneficent only to favourites arbitrarily chosen.⁶

The earliest historians mention the Slavi as divided into several tribes and as speaking different dialects. There are no very ancient remains of their language, except those words or phrases, which we find scattered through the works of foreign writers; and these mostly perverted by their want of knowledge. Besides these we have the names of places, of festivals, partly still existing, and of some dignitaries, *Knes*, *Zupan*, etc. There

⁶ See Görres' *Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Welt*, Heidelb. 1810. Kayssarov's *Versuch einer Slavischen Mythologie*, Götting. 1804. Dobrovsky's *Slavin*, p. 401—416. Durich *Bibliotheca Slavica*, Buda 1795. J. Potocki's *Voyages dans quelques parties de la Basse Saxe pour la recherche des antiquités Slaves*, etc. Hamb. 1795.

are indeed among the popular songs of the Bohemians, Servians, Russians, and several other tribes, many which are evidently derived from the pagan period ; but as they have been preserved only by tradition, we must of course assume, that their diction has been changed almost in the same proportion, as the language of common life. Hence national songs, before they have been fixed by letters, are always to be considered as much safer proofs for the genius, than for the language of a people. It is however probable that at least one Slavic idiom was cultivated to a certain degree in very ancient times ; for from the single circumstance, that Cyril's translation of the Bible, written in the middle of the ninth century, bears the stamp of uncommon perfection in its forms and of a great copiousness, it is sufficiently evident that the language must have been the means of expression for thinking men, several centuries before. There is indeed no doubt, that the state of the language as it appears in that translation, required no short interval of preparation.

The first attempts to convert portions of the Slavic race to Christianity were probably made before the seventh century ; but it was only at the beginning of the ninth, that they became partially successful. As this event was the dawn of a better day, the history of their language and literature begins only at that time. But before we enter into the examination of the different branches, we must not neglect to direct the eye of the reader to the whole trunk. This, in the most ancient times, appears to have ramified into two principal stems, the *eastern* and the *western* ; the former comprehending the Russians, Servians, Croats, and Vindes or Slovenzi ; and the latter or western stem, comprising the Bohemians, Poles, and the Prussian and Saxon Slavic races, remnants of the old Sorabae. The following enumeration of the still existing distinct nations of the Slavic race, may serve to give a clearer view of them.⁷

⁷ A boundless confusion reigns in the classification of the Slavic nations among the earlier historians and philologists. It was the learned Dobrovsky of Prague, who first brought light into this chaos and established a classification, founded on a deep and thorough examination of all the different dialects, and acknowledged by the equally high authority of Kopitar. Adelung in his *Mithridates*, Vol. II. p. 1610 sq. has adopted it ; the specific names however, Antes and Slavi, which he applies to the two great divisions, and which were first used by Jornandes, are arbitrary and less distinct than those adopted by Dobrovsky and Kopitar, who divide all Slavic nations into the

A. EASTERN STEM.

I. *Russian Branch.*

1. **RUSSIANS.** The Russians of Slavic origin form the bulk of the population of the European part of Russia. All the middle provinces of this vast empire are almost exclusively inhabited by a people of purely Slavic extraction; and almost all the Slavi, who are scattered through Asiatic Russia, belong to the same race. More mixed with Russniaks are the Cossaks of Malo-Russia, who are partly descendants of Slavi, partly of Tartars and Circassians; and dwell along the rivers Bog, Don, and Dnieper, the Euxine, and the sea of Azof. The Lettones in Courland and the Lithuanians in Grodno, Wilna, and Byalystock, with the same language and by some historians considered as a Slavic race degenerated in very ancient times, are probably a distinct people or a Finnish-Scythian tribe. The whole sum of the Russian Slavic population, belonging to the Greek church, amounts to thirty two millions.

2. **RUSSNIAKS, or RUTHENIANS.** In Malo-Russia, Poland, Galicia, Bukowina, and in the northern part of Hungary, about three millions, all of them belonging to the oriental church indeed, but partly to the Greek-Catholic or united church.

II. *Servian Branch.*

1. **BULGARIANS,** in the Turkish province Sofia Vilayeti, be-

North-Western and South-Eastern Stems. Still more distinct, and not admitting any misunderstanding, would have been the terms '*Northern and Western*,' and '*Southern and Eastern*,' division; which indeed can be the only proper meaning of those appellations. The Slovaks in Hungary, for instance, who belong to the first division, cannot properly be called a *North-Western* people; and the Russians who belong to the second, still less a *South-Eastern* nation. The origin from the South is common to all the Slavic tribes; hence the appellation of *Northern* and *Southern* can be applied to them merely in a relative sense; and that portion of the Slavic race which inhabits Russia, never is known to have lived in a more southern region than their Bohemian brethren. To avoid misapprehension, we prefer a division of the Slavi into *Eastern* and *Western* Stems. In other respects, we have, in our sketch, principally followed Schaffarik's *History of the Slavic Language and Literature, Geschichte der Slavischen Sprache und Literatur*, Buda 1826, a work of great merit, to which we are indebted, as we take pleasure in acknowledging, for whatever little merit our essay may possess.

tween the Danube, the Euxine, the Balkan, and Servia, about 600,000 in number; most of them belonging to the Greek church, and a small part of them Catholics.

2. **SERVIANS.** Servia, between the rivers Timock, Drina, Save and Danube, and the Balkan, as a Turkish province called Serf Vilayeti, has more than 800,000 inhabitants. In earlier times, and especially at the end of the seventeenth century, many of them emigrated to Hungary, where now, exclusively of their near relatives the Slavonians, 350,000 Servians are settled. Total 1,150,000, belonging to the Greek church.

3. **BOSNIANS,** between Dalmatia, the Balkan mountains, and the rivers Drina, Verbas and Save; about 350,000 in number. There are of late many Mohammedans among them, who still retain their language and most of their Slavic customs. The Majority however remain Christians, most of them belonging to the Greek church; about 100,000 are Roman Catholics.

4. **MONTENEGRINES** (Tchernogortzi). The Slavic inhabitants of the Turkish province Albania, among the mountains of Montenegro, which extend themselves from Bosnia to the sea coast as far as Antivari. This remarkable people the Turks have never been able to subjugate completely. They enjoy a sort of military-republican freedom. Their chief head is a bishop of very limited power. Between 30,000 and 60,000 souls, belonging to the Eastern church.

5. **SLAVONIANS.** Inhabitants of the Austrian kingdom of Slavonia, and the duchy of Syrmia, between Hungary and Bosnia in the North and South, 500,000 in number. A small majority belongs to the Roman, the rest to the Greek church.

6. **DALMATIANS.** The country along the Adriatic, between Croatia and Albania, together with the adjacent islands, is called the kingdom of Dalmatia, and likewise belongs at present to the Austrian empire. It has about 300,000 inhabitants, and adjoins on the N. E. Herzegovina, a part of the Turkish district of Bosnia, where live about 80,000 Dalmatians. Total 380,000; all Roman Catholics, with the exception of about 70,000 who belong to the Eastern church.

III. *Croatian Branch.*

The Austrian kingdom of Croatia of our time, between Styria, Hungary, Slavonia, Bosnia, Dalmatia, and the Adriatic, is not the ancient Croatia of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Together with the Croatian colonists in Hungary and the inhabit-

ants of the Turkish Sandsbak Banialouka, it contains about 730,000 souls. Of these 174,000 belong to the Greek church; the others are Catholics.

IV. *Vindish Branch, or Slovenzi.*

This comprises the Slavic inhabitants of the duchy of Styria, of the kingdom of Illyria, (the two Austrian duchies, Carinthia and Carniola), and of the banks of the rivers Muhr and Raab in Hungary. With the exception of a few Protestants they are all Catholics, about 800,000 in number. They call themselves Slovenzi; but are known by foreign writers under the name of *Vindes*.

B. WESTERN STEM.

I. *Bohemian Branch.*

1. **BOHEMIANS** (Tcheques). 2. **MORAVIANS.** These are the Slavic inhabitants of the kingdom of Bohemia and Margravate of Moravia, both belonging to the Austrian empire. They amount to about 3,700,000; of whom 100,000 are Protestants, the rest Catholics.

II. *Slovakish Branch.*

Almost all the northern part of Hungary is inhabited by Slovaks; besides this, they are scattered through the whole of that country, and speak different dialects. They are 1,800,000 in number; two thirds Catholics and one third Protestants.

III. *Polish Branch.*

Inhabitants of the old kingdom of Poland, of the provinces called since 1772 the Russian-Polish, of the duchy of Posen, of the Austrian kingdom of Galicia, and the republic of Cracow. Further, the Slavic part of the population of Silesia. They amount to ten millions, all Catholics, excepting half a million of Protestants.

IV. *Sorabian-Vendish Branch.*

Remnants of the old Sorabae and several other Slavic races, in Lusatia, and some parts of Brandenburg. About 200,000, Protestants and Catholics.

There is no doubt, that besides the races here enumerated, there are Slavic tribes scattered through Germany, Transylvania, Moldavia and Walachia, nay, through the whole of Turkey; as for instance the Tchaconic dialect, spoken in the eastern part of ancient Sparta and unintelligible to the other Greeks, has been proved by one of the most distinguished philologists to have been of Slavic origin.⁸ But to ascertain their number, at any rate very small, would be a matter of impossibility, and in every respect of little consequence.

As we distinguish among the nations of the Slavic race two great families, the connexion of whose members among each other is entirely independent of their present geographical situation, we find also in the Slavic language the same marked distinction. To specify the marks, by which the etymologist recognizes to which of these families each nation belongs, seems to be here out of place. The reader, without knowing the language itself, would hardly be able to comprehend them sufficiently; and he who understands it, will find better sources of information in philological works. All that concerns us here, is the general character, the genius of the language. For this purpose we will try to give in a few words a general outline of its grammar, exhibiting principally those features, which, as being common to all or most of its different dialects, seem to be the best adapted to express its general character.

The analogy between the Slavic and the Sanscrit languages consists indeed only in the similar sound of a great many words; the construction of the former is purely European, and it has in this respect a nearer relation to the Greek, Latin and German; with which idioms it has evidently been derived from the same source.⁹ The Slavic has three genders. Like the Latin, it

⁸ By Kopitar; see the *Wiener Jahrbücher*, 1822, Vol. XVII. *Kastanica*, *Sitina*, *Gorica*, and *Prasto*, are Slavic names. There is even a place called *Σλαβοχώρη*, *Slavic village*. Leake in his *Researches* observes that Slavic names of places occur throughout all Greece.

⁹ The affinity of the Slavic and Greek languages it has recently been attempted to prove in several works. Dankovsky in his work, *Die Griechen als Sprachverwandte der Slaven*, Presburg 1828, contends that a knowledge of the Slavic language is of the highest importance for the Greek scholar, as the only means by which he may be enabled to clear up obscure passages and to ascertain the signification of doubtful words. Among the historical proofs, he furnishes a vocabulary containing 306 Slavic and Greek words of striking anal-

knows no article ; at least not the genuine Slavic ; for those dialects which have lost their national character, like the Bulgarian, or those which have been corrupted by the influence of the German,¹⁰ employ the demonstrative pronoun as an article ; and the Bulgarian has borrowed the Albanian mode of suffixing one to the noun. For this very reason the declensions are more perfect in Slavic than in German and Greek ; for the different cases, as in Latin, are distinguished by suffixed syllables or endings. The singular has seven cases ; the plural only six, the vocative having always the form of the nominative. As for the dual, a form however which the Slavic languages do not all possess, the nominative and accusative, the genitive and local, the dative and instrumental cases, are always alike.

For the declensions of adjectives the Slavic has two principal forms, according as they are *definite* or *indefinite*. The Old or Church Slavonic knows only two degrees of comparison, the positive and comparative ; it has no superlative, or rather it has the same form for the comparative and superlative. This is regularly made by the suffix *ii*, mostly united with one of those numerous sibilants, for which the English language has hardly letters or signs, *sh*, *tsh*, *scht*, etc. In the more modern dialects

ogy. "Of three sisters," he observes, "*one* kept faithful to her mother tongue—the Slavic language ; the *second* gave to that common heritage the highest cultivation—the Greek language ; and the *third* mixed the mother tongue with a foreign idiom—the Latin language." A work of the same tendency has been published in the Greek Language, by the Greek priest Constantine, Vienna 1828. It contains a vocabulary of 800 pages of *Russian* and Greek words, corresponding in sound and meaning.—That these views are not new, is generally known ; although they hardly ever have been carried so far, except perhaps by the author of the History of Russia, Levesque, who considers the Latins as a Slavic colony ; or by Solarich, who derived all modern languages from the Slavic. Gelenius in his *Lexicon Symphonum*, 1557, made the first etymological attempt in respect to the Slavic languages. In modern times, great attention has been paid to Slavic etymology by Dobrovsky, Linde, Adelung, Bantkje, Fritsch, and others. An *Etymologicon Universale* was published in 1811, at Cambridge in England, by W. Whiter.—Galiffe, in his *Italy and its inhabitants*, 1816 and 1817, started the opinion, that the *Russian* was the original language, and that the Old Slavonic and all the rest were only dialects.

¹⁰ Or rather some writers in Lusatia and the Austrian provinces comprised in the kingdom of Illyria.

this deficiency has been supplied ; in most of them a superlative form is made by prefixing the particle *naï* ; e. g. in Servian, *mudar*, wise, *mudrii*, wiser, *naïmudrii*, the wisest. The Russian, besides this and several other superlative forms, has one, that is more perfect, as proceeding from the adjective itself : *doroghii*, dear, *doroshe*, dearer, *doroshaiishii*, dearest. Equally rich is this language in augmentative and diminutive forms not only of the substantive but also of the adjective, a perfection in which even the Italian can hardly be compared to it ; of which however all the Slavic dialects possess more or less. Almost all the Russian substantives have two augmentatives and three diminutives ; some have even more. We abstain with some difficulty from adducing examples ; but we are afraid of going beyond our limits. It deserves to be mentioned as a peculiarity, that the Slavi consider only the first four ordinal numbers as adjectives, and all the following ones as substantives. For this reason, the governed word must stand in the genitive, instead of the accusative : *osm sot* (nom. *sto*), eight hundred. In all negative phrases they employ likewise the genitive instead of the accusative. A double negation occurs in Slavic frequently, without indicating an affirmation ; for even if another negation has already taken place, they are accustomed to prefix to the verb the negative particle *ne* or *nje*.

In respect to the verb, it is difficult to give a general idea of its character ; for it is in the forms of this part of speech, that there reigns the greatest variety in the numerous dialects of the Slavic language. The same termination which in Old Slavonic and in Russian indicates invariably the first person of the present, *u* or *gu*, is in Servian that of the third person plural of the present and imperfect ; and the general termination of the Servian and the Polish for the first person of the present, *am*, *em* or *im*, is in Old Slavonic and Russian used for the plural, *em* and *im*. There is however one fundamental form through all the Slavic dialects for the second person of the present, a termination in *ash*, *esh* or *ish* ; and this is consequently the person, by which it is to be recognized to what conjugation a verb belongs.

The division of the verbs adopted in all other European languages into *Active* and *Passive*, seems to be useless in Slavic ; for their being active or passive has no influence upon their flexion ; and the forms of the Latin *Passive* and *Deponent* must in Slavic be expressed by a circumlocution. A division of more

importance and springing from the peculiarity of the language itself, is that into verbs *Perfect* and *Imperfect*. Neither the Greek, nor the Latin, nor the German, nor any of the languages descending from them, admits of a similar distinction. It seems therefore difficult for persons not perfectly acquainted with any Slavic dialect, to form to themselves a clear idea of it. It is however one of their most striking features, which adds very considerably to their general richness and power. The relation in which the perfect and imperfect verbs stand to each other, is about the same as that of the perfect and imperfect tenses in the conjugation of the Latin verb. Perfect verbs express that an action takes place a single time, and therefore is entirely completed and past; from their very nature it results, that they have no imperfect tense, and their conjugation must be in general incomplete. Imperfect verbs express that the same action continues. Both have in most cases the same radical syllable, and may be formed with a certain degree of freedom; thus in Servian, *viknuti*, to cry once, *vikati*, to be crying; *umrijeti*, to die, *umirati*, to be dying. There are however others, which stand in the same relation to each other without issuing from the same verbal stock; e. g. in Servian, *tchuti* and *slushati*, to hear; *retji* and *govoriti*, to speak, etc.

The Polish language, which is remarkably rich in every kind of flexion, has a still simpler and more regular way of forming also a frequentative out of almost every verb; e. g. *czytam*, I read, *czytuję*, I read often; *biore*, I take, *bieram*, I take often, etc. In Bohemian, in respect to grammar by far the most cultivated of the Slavic languages, there is a refinement in the tenses, of which even the most perfect knowledge of the classical languages gives hardly any idea, and the right use of which is seldom, if ever, acquired by foreigners. Duration, decision, repetition, all the different shades of time and purpose, which other languages have to circumscribe in long phrases, the Bohemian expresses by a slight alteration of one or two syllables.

Not less rich in these variations of the verb is the Russian. Besides a vast treasure of original, genuine *indefinite* verbs, as they call all those, which have the general character of the verb of other languages, without any allusion to the duration or continuance of the action, they have verbs *simple*, *frequentative*, and *perfect*. A single example will illustrate the fact:

Verb indefinite *dvigat'*,¹¹ to move.

Verb simple *dviniut'*, to move a single time.

Verb frequentative *dvigivat'*, to move repeatedly.¹²

Verb perfect *sdvigat'*, to move completely.

The reader may judge for himself of what precision, compactness, and energy, a language is capable, which has so little need of circumlocution. It must be mentioned, however, that not all these verbs are complete ; as indeed in many cases, it is obvious from their very nature, that many tenses must be wanting. It is probably for this reason, that some of the most distinguished grammarians do not acknowledge this division of the verb itself ; but put all its variations under the conjugation of a single verb, as different tenses,—a proceeding, which contributes much to make the Slavic grammar a horror to all foreigners.

If this short and meagre sketch is hardly sufficient to give the reader an idea of the richness, precision, and general perfectibility of the Slavic languages, it will be still more difficult to reconcile his mind to their *sound* ; against which the most decided prejudices exist among all foreigners. The old Slavic alphabet has forty-six letters ; from this variety it can justly be concluded that the language had originally at least nearly as many different sounds, although a great part of them are no longer to be found in the modern Slavic languages. It is true that all the dialects are comparatively poor in vowels, and like the oriental languages, utterly deficient in diphthongs.¹³ They have neither the *oe* nor *ue*, which the Germans consider as the best sounds of their idiom ; nor the Greek *ei*, *vi*, *av*, *ev*, etc. still less the variety of pronunciation of one and the same vowel, peculiar to the English. The Poles, Russians, and Bohemians, possess however a twofold *i*,¹⁴ a finer and a coarser one, the latter of which is not to be found in any other European lan-

¹¹ The *t'* signifies the *Yehr*, or so-called *soft sign* of the Russians in addition to the *t*. This letter not existing in the English language, we have endeavoured to supply it in the best possible way by the aspirate of the Greek language, which when it follows *τ*, is not very unlike it ; e. g. *νυκτ' ἡμερον*, written *νυχθήμερον*. The real sound, however, is more like the German soft *ch* after *t*, as in *Städtchen*, *Hütchen*.

¹² They are to be compared with the Latin verbs frequentative, as *facitare* instead of *facere*, *cursitare* instead of *currere*, etc.

¹³ With the exception of the Slovakish dialect.

¹⁴ Pronounce the *i* as in the word *machine*.

guage; and the Poles besides this have nasal vowels, as other languages have nasal consonants.¹⁵

It is a striking peculiarity, that Slavic words very seldom begin with a pure *a*,¹⁶ hardly ever with *e*.¹⁷ There are in the whole Russian language, only two words of Slavic origin, which have an initial *e*, and about twenty foreign ones in which this letter has been preserved in its purity; in all the rest the *e* is introduced by *y*; e. g. *Yelisaveta*, Elizabeth; *yest'*, it is, est; *Yepiscop*, episcopus, bishop; *yeres*, heresy, etc. The initial *a* is more frequent, and is especially preserved in most foreign proper names; e. g. Alexander, Anna, etc. or in other foreign words, where they omit the *H*; as *Ad*, Hades, Hell, *Alleluya*, Hallelujah. But the natural tendency of the language is to introduce it likewise by *y*; thus they say *yagnya*, in preference to *agnya*, agnus, although this last also is to be found in the old church books; *yasti*, to eat, *yakor*, anchor, *yavor*, maple, German *ahorn*.¹⁸ The *a* in the beginning of words is pure in most Slavic dialects, i. e. without a preceding consonant. In Russian it sounds frequently more like an *a* than an *o*; e. g. *adin*, one, instead of *odin*; *atoltz*, father, instead of *oteltz*. But the Vendes of Lusatia pronounce it *vo*; as also the Bohemians in the language of common life; although in higher style they have a pure initial *o*. The Croatians, on the other hand, have no pure initial *u*; they say *vuho*, ear, instead of *uho* or *ucho*.

As to consonants, there is a great variety in the Slavic languages. There is however no *f* to be found in any genuine Slavic word; and even in words adopted from foreign languages, this letter has frequently changed its sound. So the Bohemian has made *barwa* from the German *farbe*, colour. In respect to the connexion of the Slavic with the Latin, it is interesting to compare *bob* with *faba*, *bodu* with *fodio*, *vrū* with *ferveo*, *paru* with *ferio*, *plamen* with *flamma*, *pishčala* with *fistula*, etc.

The greatest variety among the Slavic letters exists in the sibilants. Of these there are seven, perfectly distinct from each other; some of which it would be difficult to denote by English

¹⁵ The Portuguese *ã*, *ẽ*, etc. are apparently nasal vowels, but in reality only different modes of writing for *am*, *em*, etc.

¹⁶ The English *a* in *father*.

¹⁷ Like the English *e* in *they*.

¹⁸ Compare the smooth breathing of the Greeks, and the Shemitish *Aleph* or *Elif*.

characters.¹⁹ They are the favourite sounds of the language. Not only the guttural sounds, *g*, *ch*, and *k*, but also *d* and *t*, are changed in many cases into analogous sibilants, according to fixed and very simple rules. On the other hand, the Slavic nations have a way of softening the harshness of the consonants, peculiar in that extent to them alone. The Frenchman has his *l mouillé*, the Spaniard his *elle doblado* and *ñ*, the Portuguese his *lh* and *nh*; the Slavic nations possess the same softening sound for almost all their consonants. Such is the usual termination of the Russian verb in *ai'* or *i'*, etc. where other Slavic nations say *ai* or *iti*, or those of the western branch *ac* or *ec*. In the same manner it occurs after initial consonants; thus *mjaso*, meat; *bjel*, white; *ljubov*, love, etc.

The letters *l* and *r* have in all Slavic languages the value of vowels; words like *turdy*, *wjtr*, which judging from their appearance a foreigner would despair of ever being able to pronounce, are always in metre used as words of two syllables. Thus *Wlk*, *Srp*, are not harsher than *Wolk* and *Serp*. We feel however that these examples cannot serve to refute the existing prejudices against the euphony of the Slavic languages. Instead of ourselves, let one of their most eloquent and warmest advocates defend them against the reproach of roughness and harshness.²⁰ "Euphony and feminine softness of a language are two very different things. It is true that in most of the Slavic dialects, with the exception of the Servian, the consonants are predominant; but if we consider a language in a philosophical point of view, the consonants, as being the signs of ideas, and the vowels, as being mere bearers in the service of the consonants, appear in a quite different light. The more consonants, the richer is a language in ideas. *Exempla sunt in promptu*. The euphony of single syllables is only partial and relative; but the harmony of a whole language depends on the euphonic sound of periods, words, syllables, and single letters. What language possesses these four elements of harmony in equal measure? Too many vowels sound just as unpleasantly as too many consonants; a suitable number and interchange of both is requisite to produce true harmony. Even harsh syllables belong to the necessary qualities of a language; for nature herself has harsh sounds, which the poet would be unable to paint without

¹⁹ There is e. g. a single letter in old Slavonic and Russian for *śsk*. The Pole writes *szcz*.

²⁰ Schaffarik in his *Geschichte*, etc. p. 40 sq.

harsh sounding tones. The roughness of the Slavic idioms, of which foreigners have complained so frequently, is therefore exclusively to be ascribed to the awkwardness of inexperienced or tasteless writers; or they are ridiculous mistakes of the reader, who, unacquainted with the language, receives the sounds with his eyes instead of his ears."—"The pure and distinct vocalization, which does not leave it to the arbitrary choice of the speaker to pronounce certain vowels or to pass them over, as is the case in German, French, and English, gives at the same time to the Slavic languages the advantage of a regular quantity of their syllables, as in Greek; which makes them better adapted than any other for imitating the old classic metres. We must confess, however, that this matter has been hitherto neglected in most of them, or has been treated with little intelligence. We mean to say: Each Slavic syllable is by its very nature either short or long; since each Slavic vowel has a twofold duration, both short and long. This natural shortening and lengthening of a syllable is, as with the Greeks, entirely independent of the grammatical stress or falling of the voice upon them, or in other words, of the *prosodic tone*; the *quantity* being founded on the nature of the pronunciation, on the longer or shorter duration of the vowel itself, and not on the grammatical accent. This latter may lie just as well on syllables prosodically short, as on those which are long."

From these introductory remarks, we turn again to the historical part of our essay, referring the reader back to our division of the whole Slavic race into the Eastern and Western Stems. There are three languages, perfectly distinct from each other, spoken by the Eastern Slavic nations; besides that most remarkable Old or Church Slavonic, the language of their Bible, now no longer a living tongue, but still the inexhaustible source of the sublimest and holiest expressions for its younger sisters. Each of them possesses a literature of its own; and one of them, the Servian, even a double literature; for political circumstances and the influence of the early division of the oriental and occidental churches having unfortunately split the nation into two parts, caused them also to adopt two different methods of writing one and the same language, as we shall show in the sequel.²¹

²¹ We abstain here from giving any historical references, as it would swell our notes to a book; and historical notices, with the exception of those circumstances in immediate connexion with the *language*, cannot properly be expected here. All philological sources have been faithfully mentioned.

A. EASTERN SLAVI.

I. *History of the Old or Church Slavic (commonly called Slavonic) Language and Literature.*

It can hardly be doubted that in very ancient times the whole Slavic race spoke only one language. This seems however very early to have been broken up into several dialects; and such indeed must have been the natural result of the wide extension of the people. Eginhard, the secretary and historian of Charlemagne, d. 839, calls the Slavic nations, whom his hero subjugated, Veletabae, Sorabae, Obotrites, and Bohemians; and mentions expressly that they did not all speak the same, but a very similar language. It would be difficult to decide what portion of the still existing Slavic tongue has kept itself the purest; the Old Slavic has its Graecisms, the Servian its Turcisms, the Polish and Bohemian their Germanisms, the Russian its Tartarisms, Germanisms, and Gallicisms. No language in the world will ever resist the influence of the languages of its neighbours; and even the lofty Chinese wall cannot protect the inhabitants of that vast empire from corruptions in their language. It was formerly the general view, that the ecclesiastical Slavonic was to be considered as the *mother* of all the living Slavic dialects; and there are indeed even now a few philologists and historians, who still adhere to that opinion. The deeper investigations of modern times, wherever an equal share of profound erudition and love of truth has happened to be united in the same persons, have sufficiently proved, that the church Slavonic is to be considered, not as the mother of all the other Slavic languages, but as standing to them only in the relation of an elder sister,—a *dialect* like them, but earlier developed and cultivated. The original mother-tongue, from which they were all derived, must have perished many centuries ago. But *where* the Old Slavonic was once spoken, and which of the still living dialects has been developed *immediately* out of it,—an honour to which all the nations of the eastern stem, and one of the western, aspire,—is a question which all the investigations and conclusions of able historians and philologists have not hitherto been able to answer in a satisfactory manner. The highest authorities in Slavic matters are divided on this point.

The claims of the Russians are easily refuted, as utterly destitute of any historical foundation. The circumstance, however,

that the language of the Slavic Bible was in Russia, until the reign of Peter the Great, exclusively the language of books, confirmed the natives for a long time in the belief, that the old Russian and the church Slavic were one and the same language; and that the modern Russian was the immediate descendant of the latter; until modern criticism has better illustrated the whole subject.²²

The great similarity of the *Slovakish* language with the Old Slavic, especially of the national dialect spoken by those Slovaks, who live scattered through Hungary, and the correspondence of their grammatical forms and flexions, to a degree not found in any other Slavic language, seems to decide for the Slovaks. An historical basis is likewise not wanting to this hypothesis; for the Slovaks belonged formerly to the great kingdom of Moravia, where, according to all the ancient historians, Cyril and Methodius lived and taught the longest.²³

On the other side, the venerable Bohemian Abbot Dobrovsky, who has examined the opinions of his predecessors with more exactness and erudition, and investigated the nature of the different Slavic dialects more deeply than any philologist before him, decides for the *Servians*. According to him, the Old Slavic was, in the time of Cyril and Methodius, the Servian-Bulgarian-Macedonian dialect, the language of the Slavi in Thessalonica, the birthplace of these two Slavic apostles.²⁴

His grounds seemed indeed incontestible, until Kopitar, a name of equal authority and importance in Slavic matters, who formerly agreed with him,²⁵ proved in a later work,²⁶ with reasons of no less weight, that the true home of the language of the Slavic Bible was to be sought among the *Pannonic* or *Caran-*

²² See below in the History of the Russian Language and the so called *Improvement* of the Bible and church books.

²³ In modern times this view has been defended principally by Russian philologists, the Metropolitan Eugene, Kalajdovitch, etc.

²⁴ See his *Kyrill und Method*, Prague, 1823. Schloezzer considers likewise the Old Slavic as a Bulgarian dialect of the ninth century. See his *Northern History*, p. 330. In another place he calls it the mother of the other Slavic languages; see his *Nestor*, I. p. 46.

²⁵ In his *Grammar of the Slavic Language in Carniola, Carinthia, and Styria*.

²⁶ *Jahrbücher der Literatur*, Vienna 1822, Vol. XVII. Grimm is of the same opinion; see the preface to his translation of Vuk Stephano-vitch's Servian Grammar.

tasno-Slavi, the *Slovensi* or *Vindes* of the present times.* These were Methodius' own diocesans; for their instruction the Scriptures were first translated, and only carried by the two brethren, at a later period, to the Bulgarians and Moravians, who easily understood the kindred dialect.

Be this as it may, the Old Slavonic has long since become the common property of all the Slavic nations, and its treasures are for all of them an inexhaustible mine. Dobrovsky counted in it 1605 radical syllables.²⁷ Hence, it is not only rich in its present state, but has in itself the inestimable power of augmenting its richness, the faculty of creating new forms of expression for new ideas. But its great perfection does not consist alone in this multiplicity of words. Schloezer, the great historian and linguist, justly observes: "Among all modern languages the Slavonic (Old Slavic) is one of those which are most fully developed. With its richness and other perfections I have here no concern. How it became so, the history of its cultivation sufficiently explains. Its model was the Greek language, in those days the most cultivated in the world; although Cedrenus no longer wrote like Xenophon. No idiom was more capable than the Slavonic of adopting the beauties of the Greek. The translators, intending a literal version, and not like Caedmon the Anglo-Saxon, or Otfried the German, a mere *poetic metaphor*, were in a certain measure compelled to *subdue* their own language, to make it flexible, to invent new turns, in order faithfully to imitate the original."²⁸

After having ceased for centuries to be a language of common life, the Old Slavic has of course lost that kind of pliancy and facility, which only a living language, employed to express all the daily wants of men, can possibly acquire. But for this same reason it has gained infinitely in solemnity and dignity. Imposing by its very sound, exciting in the minds of millions sanctifying religious associations, it seems to have grown almost unfit for any vulgar use, and exclusively devoted to holy, or at least to serious and dignified subjects.

There are, as we have mentioned above, many circumstances, which seem to justify the opinion, that the Slavi were very early in possession of a degree of cultivation, which makes it indeed

* See above, p. 336.

²⁷ Dobrovsky's *Entwurf zu einer allgemeinen Slavischen Etymologie*, Prague 1812. See also the *Slovanka* of this celebrated scholar.

²⁸ Schloezer's *Nestor*, III. p. 224.

difficult to believe, that they should not have known how to read and write before the ninth century. Neighbours of the Greeks, and in constant intercourse with them; both as a nation, by war and traffic, and through individuals who lived at the court of Constantinople; it can hardly be supposed that no earlier attempt should have been made, to adapt the Greek alphabet to the Slavic language, or to invent a new one, founded on that basis. There is however not a single satisfactory proof, that this was ever done with any degree of success before that time; notwithstanding all the grounds by which some modern writers, zealous and eloquent advocates of this opinion, have endeavoured to support it.²⁹ All the legends and early historical annals agree in calling Cyril the inventor of the Slavic alphabet.

This alphabet, as arranged by Cyril, is founded on the Greek. In arranging it, Cyril employed all the Greek characters, although a few of them have so much altered their shape in the course of time, as hardly to be recognized in their present form, e. g. the *Z* and the *H* of the Greeks. The first has the English, not the Greek pronunciation of that letter; the latter in its altered shape is the common *I* of the Slavic language, and thus corresponds with the pronunciation of the modern Greeks. The *H* or *Eta* in an unaltered form, on the other hand, is the *N* of the Slavic alphabet. The Greek *B*, β , went over into the still softer sound of *V*, *v*,* and another sign was selected for *Buki* or *B*. This and all the characters to denote Slavic sounds, which he did not find in the Greek alphabet, Cyril took from other oriental languages, wherever he could find similar sounds; and thus very judiciously avoided that accumulation of letters to mark a single sound, which occur so often in all the systems of writing derived from the Latin. In this manner he extended his alphabet to forty-six characters or signs; some of them indeed merely signs for expressing shades of pronunciation, which in other languages are denoted by marks, points, etc. Some others are not pronounced at all, and seem, at least according to the present state of the Slavic languages, utterly superfluous. Hence the Russians and Servians have diminished the number of their letters considerably; although the Russian has still some which could be amalgamated with others, or entirely omitted. Whether the Old Slavonic actually had, at the

²⁹ Rakoviecky, in his edition of the *Pravda Russka*, Warsaw 1820
^{—22.} Katanich, *Specimen Philologiae et Geographiae*, etc. 1795.

* As in Modern Greek; see Buttmann's Greek Grammar, § 3. 2.

time of Cyril's invention, so many different shades of sound, it would be difficult to decide at present, after that language has existed for so many centuries as a mere language of books.

Cyril, or, according to his baptismal name, Constantine, and Methodius his brother, belong among the benefactors of mankind; for it was they, who procured for the Slavic nations so early as the ninth century the inestimable privilege of reading the Holy Scriptures in a language familiar to their ears and minds; whilst the sacred volume yet remained, for centuries after, inaccessible to all the other European Christians, the exclusive property of the priesthood. They were born in Thessalonica, in the early part of the ninth century, of a noble family; it does not appear whether of Greek or of Slavic extraction. Macedonia, of which province Thessalonica was in the times of the Romans the capital, was inhabited by many Slavi at a very early period. Constantine, who obtained by his learning and abilities the surname of the Philosopher, could have learned Slavic here, even without belonging to the Slavic nation. As a flourishing commercial city, this place was peculiarly favourable for learning languages; and it was probably here too, that Constantine learned Armenian; for his introducing several Armenian letters into the Slavic alphabet seems to prove, that this language was not unknown to him. When grown up his parents sent him to Byzantium, where he entered the clerical profession.

There came ambassadors from the Khazares, a Hunnic-Tartaric tribe, to the emperor Michael, to ask for a teacher in Christianity. On the recommendation of Ignatius, Constantine was chosen for this mission, as being particularly qualified by his eloquence and piety. On the road he stopped for some time in Cherson on the Dnieper, where he learned the Khazaric language. The empire of the Khazares extended from the Volga and the Caspian Sea, across the Caucasian isthmus and the peninsula of Taurida, as far as to Moldavia and Walachia. Several Slavic tribes were tributary to them; but about the middle of the ninth century, at the time of Cyril's mission, their power began to decline; their vassals became their enemies, and gradually their conquerors; until towards the end of the tenth and at the beginning of the eleventh century, their empire became entirely extinct.* Constantine converted and baptized their Khan,

* See Rees' Cyclopaedia, art. *Khazares*; where however it is incorrectly said that they were a Turkish tribe.

whose example was followed by a great part of the nation. It was probably after he had returned from this mission, that Cyril went to convert the Bulgarians. At this time, or just before, according to Dobrovsky's opinion, he invented the Slavic letters, and translated the Gospels, during his stay in Byzantium. Between A. D. 861 and 863, there came another embassy to the emperor, from the Moravian prince Rostislav, who asked for a teacher, not only to instruct his subjects in Christianity more perfectly than it had been done before, but also to teach them *to read*. Most of the Moravians were already baptized. Constantine, accompanied by his brother Methodius, was sent to Moravia, where the people received them with expressions of joy. They introduced here the Slavic liturgy, and preached in the Slavic language. One peculiar circumstance served to give to their persons a more than common sanctity. Constantine had been so fortunate as to discover in Cherson the bones of the holy Clement, relicts which he everywhere carried with him. After three or four years, the pope invited the two brethren to Rome, where the possession of these relics procured him great honour and distinction. The pope Adrian, followed by the clergy and people, met them and their treasure before the gates of the city. Both the brothers were consecrated as bishops; those of their Moravian disciples who had accompanied them to Rome, were made priests and deacons. Constantine received the consecration, but did not accept the diocese allotted to him. With the permission of the pope, he adopted the name of Cyril, and died forty days afterwards, Feb. 13, A. D. 868. His remembrance is cherished as holy by the Slavic nations; and even as early as A.D. 1056, we find in the calendar of the *Evangelium of Ostromir*, the fourteenth of February set down for the celebration of his memory.

Methodius returned to Moravia the same year, A. D. 868. He was what was called an *episcopus regionarius*, and had therefore no fixed residence. In the letters of pope John VIII, he is called bishop of Moravia and Pannonia. The first of these countries was at this period the theatre of bloody wars; the Slavic inhabitants of the other had been already as early as A. D. 798 converted to Christianity by German priests. In consequence of this, Methodius found the Latin worship established here, and the Latin language in use. The innovation made by him, however, was of course greatly favoured by the people, who for the first time heard the gospel read to them in a lan-

guage they understood. But it found the more opposition with the priests. The whole jealousy of the Roman church seems to have been awakened by Methodius' proceedings. He found however a protector in the pope himself, who feared perhaps an entire alienation of the Slavic population, and their transition to the Oriental church. But he was at the same time desirous to preserve the whole authority of the Latin language. In a letter to the Moravian prince Svatopluk, he enjoins expressly, "that in all the Moravian churches the gospel, for the sake of the greater dignity, should be read first in Latin, and afterwards translated into Slavic for the people ignorant of the Latin."

The question, what part of the Scriptures was translated by Cyril himself, what by his brother, and what supplements were made by their immediate successors, can now hardly be answered in a satisfactory manner. The honour of the invention of the alphabet appears to belong exclusively to Cyril; but in the sacred work of translation, Methodius was not less active, and his merits in respect to the conversion and instruction of the Slavi, were more favoured by a longer life. According to John, exarch of Bulgaria, Cyril translated only *selections* from the Gospels and the *Apostle*, as the book of Acts and the apostolic epistles are together called in Slavic; i. e. a *Lectionarium*, or extracts from those parts of the Scriptures, arranged in such a way as to serve as a lesson for every sacred day through the whole year. The Russians call such a collection *Aprakoss*, the Greeks *εὐαγγέλια, ἐκλογαδια*. A work of this description is the above mentioned Evangelium of Ostromir, of the year 1056, written out expressly for the domestic use of Ostromir, *posadnik*³⁰ of Novogorod, a near relation of the grand-duke of Izjaslav. It is however more probable, that Cyril translated at first the whole of the Gospels, as still contained in a Codex of A. D. 1144, in the library of the Synod of Moscow. The Presbyter of Dioeclea, who wrote about A. D. 1161, ascribes to Cyril not only the translation of the Gospels, but also of the Psalter;³¹ and at a later period that of the whole Old and New Testaments, as well as of the "Massa," i. e. the Greek liturgy of Basiliius and Chrysostom. This opinion has since been generally received. In respect to the Old Testament, however, it is much to be doubted;

³⁰ *Posadnik* is about the same as *Mayor*.

³¹ In the Slavic version of the Chronicle of Dalmatia, discovered in the sixth century, the Epistles instead of the Psalter are named.

since no ancient Codex of it exists, or has ever been proved to have existed. As to the New Testament, the Apocalypse must at any rate be excepted.

What part of the translation was performed by Methodius does not appear. John, exarch of Bulgaria, who lived in the same century, translated the books of Johannes Damascenus into Slavic. In the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries, the Russian and Servian princes called many learned Greeks, versed in the Slavic language, into their empires, that they might continue the holy work of translation. From the historian Nestor it appears, that the Proverbs of Solomon existed in the twelfth century in Slavic. The book of Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, the Prophets, and Job were translated in Servia in the thirteenth or fourteenth century; the Pentateuch in Russia or Poland A. D. 1400, or about that time. It is certain that towards the close of the fifteenth century, the whole Bible was already translated into Old Slavic. According to Dobrovsky, the different parts of it were not collected until after A. D. 1488, when the Bohemian Bible of Prague was printed. This latter served as a model for the arrangement of the Slavonic Bible; what was wanting was at that time supplied, and those books of the Old Testament which had been translated from the Greek, were reviewed and corrected according to the Vulgate. The Codex of Moscow of A. D. 1499, the most ancient existing copy of the whole Bible in the Old Slavic, is probably at the same time the first which was ever wholly completed.

The domains of the Old Slavic language, which seemed at first to be of very great extent, were soon, by the well known jealousy of the Roman church, limited to Russia and Servia. In Bohemia, which owed its conversion to German priests, the Slavic liturgy seems never to have been generally introduced; and the old Slavic church language has therefore exerted only a very inconsiderable influence on the Bohemian. In Poland too, the Slavic liturgy was only *tolerated*, although the first books with Cyrillic types were printed there. In Moravia, Pannonia, and Illyria, the Slavonic worship was, after some struggle, supplanted by the Latin; the language however was partly saved; and that in a very singular way.

At a synod held at Salona in Dalmatia in A. D. 1060, Methodius, notwithstanding several popes had been his patrons, was declared a heretic; and it was resolved that henceforth no mass should be read but in the Latin or Greek language. From

the decrees of that synod, it appears that they took the Gothic and Slavonic for the same idiom. A great part of the inhabitants of Illyria remained nevertheless faithful to their language, and to a worship familiar to their minds through that language. A singular means was found by some of the shrewder priests, to reconcile their inclinations with the jealous despotism of Rome. A new alphabet was invented, or rather the Cyrillic letters were altered and transformed in such a way, as to approach in a certain measure to the Coptic characters. To give some authority to the new invention, it was ascribed to Jerome himself, who was a native of Dalmatia. This is the so-called Glagolitic alphabet, used by the Slavic priests of Dalmatia and Croatia until the present time.³² Cyril's translation of the Bible and the liturgic books were copied in these characters with a very few deviations in the language; which probably had their foundation in the difference of the Dalmatian dialect, or were the result of the progress of time; for this event took place in A. D. 1220, at least 360 years after the invention of the Cyrillic alphabet. With this modification, the priests succeeded in satisfying both the people and the chair of Rome. It sounded the same to the people, and looked different to the pope. The people submitted easily to the ceremonies of the Roman catholic worship, if only their beloved language was preserved; and the pope, fearing justly the transition of the whole Slavic population of those provinces to the Greek church, permitted the mass to be read in Slavonic, in order to preserve his influence in general. The reader will find more on this subject in the sequel, under the head of Servian, Dalmatian, and Glagolitic literature.

According to Vostokof, a modern Russian writer of distinction,³³ the history of the Old Slavic or Church language and its literary cultivation, divides itself into three periods:

1. From Cyril, or from the ninth century, to the thirteenth

It must be mentioned here, that by all old writers a more venerable and mostly a very ancient origin, has been claimed for the Glagolitic alphabet. By some it has been derived from the Runes of the Goths and Getæ; by others from the Thracians and Phrygians, etc. Dobrovsky has however proved by irrefutable arguments, that it is not older than the thirteenth century. The above narrative rests on his authority. See his *Glagolitica*, Prague, 1807. Schaffarik's *Geschichte*, etc. p. 240.

³³ In his essay, "On the Old Slavic Language;" see the Russian periodical: *Treatises of a Society of friends of Russian Literature*, No. XVII. Mosc. 1820.

century. This is the *ancient* genuine Slavonic; as appears from the manuscripts of that period.

2. From the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. This is the *middle* age of the Slavonic, as altered gradually by Russian copyists, and full of Russisms.

3. From the sixteenth century to the present time. This comprises the *modern* Slavonic of the church books printed in Russia and Poland; especially after the so-called *Improvement* of those writings.

The most ancient documents of the Old Slavic language, are not older than the middle of the eleventh century. There has been indeed recently discovered a manuscript of the translation of John of Damascus, written by John, exarch of Bulgaria, in the ninth century. Vostokof however proves on philological grounds, that it cannot be the original, but is a later copy. The abovementioned Evangelium of Ostromir (1056) is the earliest monument of the language, as to the age of which no doubt exists. It is preserved in the imperial library at St. Petersburg. According to Vostokof this is the third, or perhaps the fourth copy of Cyril's own translation. This latter is irretrievably lost, as well as the copy which was made for Vladimir the Great, a hundred years afterwards.

Only a few years younger is a *Sbornik*, A. D. 1073, or a collection of ecclesiastical writings, discovered in the year 1817, and a similar *Sbornik* of 1076; the former in a convent near Moscow, the other now in the library of the imperial Hermitage of St. Petersburg. Farther: the *Evangelium of Mistislav*, written before the year 1125, for the prince Mistislav Vladimirowitch; and another *Evangelium* of the year 1143, both at present in ecclesiastical libraries at Moscow.

Besides these venerable documents, there are several inscriptions on stones, crosses, and monuments, of equal antiquity; and a whole series of political documents, contracts, ordinances, and similar writings; among which one of the most remarkable is the oldest manuscript of the *Pravda Russkaya*,³⁴ a collection of the laws of Jaroslav, A. D. 1260. The libraries of the Russian convents possess a large number of manuscripts, some of which

³⁴ This remarkable manuscript was not known before 1738, when it was discovered in the chronicles of Novogorod. It has since been published in six different editions, the first prepared by Schlözer 1767, the last by the Polish scholar Rakowiecky, enriched with remarks and illustrations. See note 29.

are of great value. The Synodal library at Moscow alone, has a treasure of 700 Old Slavic Codices. Many of them are out of the earliest period. The Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg possesses 250 Slavic manuscripts; and what treasures are buried in the convents of Servia, Bulgaria, and Mount Athos, has never yet been investigated. Among the libraries of foreign countries, those of Vienna and the Vatican are rich in Old Slavic manuscripts; and there is hardly any large collection of books in Europe, which has not some of more or less value to exhibit.

The number of these monuments of the Old Slavonic sagments considerably in the *second* period; and we find ourselves the more obliged to be satisfied with mentioning only the most important among them. At the head of these, stands undoubtedly the *Laurentian Codex*, or the oldest existing copy of *Nestor's Annals*, A. D. 1377, now in the imperial library at St. Petersburg. Nestor, a monk in a convent near Kief, born A. D. 1056, was the father of Russian history. He wrote *Annals* in the Old Slavic language, which form the basis of Slavic history, and are of importance for the whole history of the middle ages. They were first printed in A. D. 1767, and subsequently in four editions, the last in 1796. Schlözer, the great German historian, who published them anew in 1802—9, with a translation, added considerably to their original value by a critical and historical commentary upon them.

The *third* period begins with the sixteenth century. In the course of time, and after passing through the hands of so many ignorant copyists, the holy books had of course undergone a change; nay, were in some parts grown unintelligible. The necessity of a revision was therefore very strongly felt. In A. D. 1512, the Patriarch of Constantinople, at the request of the Tzar Basilus Ivanovitch, sent a learned Greek, monk of Mount Athos, to Moscow, to revise the church books, and to correct them according to the Greek originals. As this person some years afterwards fell into disgrace and could not accomplish the work, it was taken up repeatedly in the course of the same and the following century, until the revision of the liturgical books was pronounced to be finished in A. D. 1667; but that of the Bible not before A. D. 1751. The principles on which this revision, or, as it was called, *Improvement*, was made, were in direct contradiction with the reverence due to the genius of the Slavic language. The revisers, in their unphilosophical mode of proceeding, tried only to imitate the Greek original,

and to assimilate the grammatical part of the language as much as possible to the Russian of their own times. They all acted in the conviction, that the language of the Bible and liturgical books was merely *obsolete Russian*. Even the latest revisers of the Bible, in 1751, knew nothing of Cyril or Methodius; and had no doubt that the first translation was made in Russia under Vladimir the Great, A. D. 988, in the language which was then spoken.

Such other works in Old Slavic, as were the productions of this period, seem rather to belong to the history of the Russian and Servian literature. We have seen from the preceding, that the Old Slavic had altered considerably; nay, was in a certain measure amalgamated with those dialects. We shall see in the sequel, how it was gradually exchanged for them.³⁵

The printing of works in the Old Slavic at the present day, is almost exclusively limited to the Bible and to what is in immediate connexion with it. The first printed Slavonic work was set in Glagolitic letters. This was a missal of A. D. 1483.³⁶ The earliest Cyrillic printing office was founded about A. D. 1490, at Kracow, by Svaipold Feol. Nearly at the same time, 1492, they began in Servia and Herzegovina to print with Cyrillic types. In A. D. 1519, a Cyrillic-Slavonic printing office was established at Venice; and about the same time, a part of the Old Testament in the White-Russian dialect, printed with Cyrillic letters, was published at Prague in Bohemia.

In Russia, now the principal seat of the eastern Slavic literature, printing was not introduced until after the middle of the sixteenth century. The first work was published in Moscow

³⁵ According to Vostokof, the dialects of all the Slavic nations deviated not only much less from each other at the time of Cyril's translation than they now do; but were even in the middle of the eleventh century still so similar, that the different nations were able to understand each other, about as well as the present inhabitants of the different provinces of Russia understand each other. The difference of the Slavic dialects was then almost exclusively limited to the lexical part of the language; the grammatical varieties which exist among them at the present day, had not then arisen. The principal features which distinguish the Russian of the present day from the Slavonic, are exhibited in the article on *Russian Literature* in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, Vol. I. p. 602.

³⁶ We learn that M. von Koeppen several years ago discovered a Slavic work printed in 1475; but being unacquainted with the details, we are unable to give a particular notice of it.

A. D. 1564, an edition of the *Apostle*, executed by the united skill of two printers. It would seem, however, that they did not succeed in Russia; for a few years after we find one of them in Lemberg, occupied in printing the same book; and the other at Wilna, in printing the Gospels. In Russia the Gospels were printed for the first time in A. D. 1606. The first complete Slavonic Bible was published at Ostrog in Volhynia (Poland) A. D. 1581, fol. printed after the Ms. of 1499, which also was the first that comprehended the whole Bible.* The second edition of the whole Slavonic Bible was printed eighty-two years later, at Moscow, A. D. 1663. An enumeration of all the subsequent editions, is given in the note below.³⁷

The philological part of the church Slavonic language was not cultivated so early as would have been desirable. There exists however a grammar by Zizania, published A. D. 1596 in Warsaw. Twenty years afterwards another by M. Smotris-ky appeared, Wilna 1618. This work was for a long time considered as of good authority; it reappeared in several editions, and served as the basis of most of the grammars written during the 17th and 18th centuries. In the year 1822, the Abbot Dobrovsky published his *Institutiones Linguae Slavicæ dialecti veteris*, a grammatical work which, like all the productions of this distinguished scholar, throws a new light upon the subject, and renders all former works of a similar character useless.

The lexical part of this literature is still more defective. Most of the existing dictionaries are merely short and unsatisfactory vocabularies. The most ancient is the work of P. Berynda, *Lex. Slaveno-Russicum*, Kief 1627. More in use at present are the *Kratkoi Slowar Slavjanskoi*, or 'Short Slavic Dictionary,' by Eugenius, St. Pet. 1784, and the larger 'Church Dic-

* See above, p. 352.

³⁷ The two first editions are described above. The *third* edition did not appear till nearly a century later, after the revision of the text had been completed, Moscow 1751, fol. Subsequent editions are as follows: Moscow 1756, fol. ib. 1757, fol. St. Petersburg. 1756, fol. Kief 1758, fol. St. Petersburg. 1759, fol. Mosc. 1759, 3 vols. 8vo. ib. 1762, fol. ib. 1766, fol. ib. 1778, 5 vols. 8vo. Kief 1779, fol. Mosc. 1784, fol. Kief 1788, 5 vols. 8vo. Mosc. 1790, fol. ib. 1797, fol. ib. 1802, fol. Ofen (Buda) 1804, 5 vols. 8vo. Mosc. 1806, 4 vols. 8vo. ib. 1810, fol. ib. 1813, 5 vols. 8 vo. ib. 1815, 8vo. St. Petersburg. 1816, 8vo. stereotype edition, issued sixteen times up to 1824. Also in 4to, stereotype edition, issued five times from 1819 to 1821.

tionary' by Alexejef, 4th ed. St. Pet. 1817—19. A dictionary of this dialect for the special use of foreigners, does not yet exist.³⁸

In modern times considerable attention has been devoted to the examination of the Old Slavic language, and its relation to its kindred dialects. Antiquarian and paleographical researches have been happily combined with philological investigations; and the eminent names which are found among these diligent and philosophical inquirers, ensure the best prospects to their cause.³⁹

II. History of the Russian Language and Literature.

The name of *Russia* and the *Russians* is not older than the ninth or tenth century. The northern part of that vast empire, however, was long before inhabited by Slavic nations, who seem to have been divided into small states under chiefs chosen by themselves; to have been peaceful in their character, and most of them tributary to more powerful neighbours. About the middle of the ninth century, civil dissensions arose among the Slavi of Novogorod, at the election of a new head or *posadnik*. Troubled at the same time from without, by the conquering and enterprizing spirit of the Varegians, a Scandinavian tribe, they no longer felt able to make resistance against them; and therefore, A. D. 862, they chose Rurik, the chief of the Varegians, for their own head. These Scandinavians were by the Finns called *Ruotzi*, an appellation which in their language signifies

³⁸ Schaffarik mentions that an Old Slavonic Grammar and Dictionary was prepared and ready in manuscript, by Vostokof, in 1826. Whether these works have been since printed we are not informed; nor do we know on what the expectation which he expresses, p. 126, that this deficiency of the Slavic language would be supplied by Kopitar, is founded.

³⁹ Very valuable and detailed notices on all the subjects in immediate connexion with the Old Slavic and modern Russian Bible, are to be found in Henderson's *Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia*, etc. Lond. 1826. As this book is accessible in this country, and our limits are narrow, we abstain from giving more than a general reference to it, as containing the best information on Slavic matters ever written in the English language. The reader will find there too a table of the Cyrillic and Glagolitic alphabet, taken from Dobrovsky's *Institutiones*.

strangers. This name, in a somewhat altered form, passed over to the inhabitants of the acquired territory, with whom the conquerors soon amalgamated. Rurik founded thus the first Slavo-Russian state; and his followers, long accustomed to a warlike nomadic mode of life, settled down among the Slavic inhabitants of the country. The nationality of the *strangers*, comparatively few in number, was merged in that of the natives; but still, in one respect, it exercised a strong influence upon the latter, by infusing into them the warlike spirit of the former. It is only since that time, that we find the Slavi as conquerors. Their empire rapidly extended in the course of the following hundred and fifty years, and their power and external influence also rose; while at the same time the ancient civil institutions of the native Slavi were respected and improved. In the beginning of the eleventh century, Jaroslav, the son of Vladimir the Great, imitating his father's example, divided on his death-bed his empire among his sons, and thus sowed the seeds of dissension, anarchy, and bloody wars,—a case repeated so often in ancient history, that it seems to be one of the few from which modern princes have derived a serious lesson. The Mongols broke into the country; easily subdued the Russians thus torn by internal dissensions; succeeded, A. D. 1237, in making them tributary; and kept them for two hundred years in the most dishonourable bondage. During this long period, every germ of literary cultivation perished. In the middle of the fifteenth century, Ivan Vasilevitch III,* delivered his country from the Asiatic barbarians, then weakened by domestic dissensions; conquered his Russian rivals; and united Novogorod with his own principedom of Moscow. From that period the power and physical welfare of Russia has increased without interruption to the present time. The literary cultivation of its inhabitants has likewise advanced; at first indeed with steps hardly proportioned to the external progress of the empire; but now for more than a century, in consequence of the despotic activity of their sovereigns, with a wonderful rapidity.

The history of Russian literature has three distinct periods. The first period comprises an interval of more than nine centuries, from the date of our first knowledge of the Russian Slavi, to the coming of age of Peter the Great, A. D. 1689. This period would easily admit of several subdivisions; and did we

* Also called Ivan I.

pretend in these pages to give the reader more than a *sketch* of literary history, we should perhaps find it advisable to adopt them. This long period, however, both in a comparative and an absolute sense, is so very poor, that, limited as we are, a few words will suffice to give a general survey of it; and so much the more, because the productions of this period are closely connected with the history of the Old Slavic language, and have mostly been already mentioned under that head.

The *second* period extends from the coming of age of Peter the Great to the accession of Elizabeth his daughter, A. D. 1741, which was the commencement of Lomonosof's influence.

The *third* period extends from Lomonosof the creator of Russian prose, to Karamzin the reformer of it, who was born in 1765.

The *fourth* period covers the interval from Karamzin to the present time.

Before however we begin our historical notices, a few words relating to the characteristic features of the Russian language, may find a place here. Three principal dialects are to be distinguished, viz.

1. The *Russian proper*, the true literary language of the whole Russian nation, and *spoken* in Moscow and all the central and northern part of the European Russian empire. Vulgar and corrupted branches of this dialect, are those of Suzdal and Olonetz, the last of which is mixed with Finnish words.

2. The *Malo-Russian*, the language of the south of Russia, especially towards the east. The principal difference between this dialect and the Russian proper, consists partly in the pronunciation of several letters; e. g. in that of the consonant *Т*, which sounds in the latter like *g* hard, but in the former like *h*, as *hospodin* instead of *gospodin*, master, lord; partly in many obsolete forms of expression, which seem to give to the Malo-Russian a nearer relationship to the Old Slavic, in which similar idioms are to be found. The influence of the Poles, who for nearly two centuries were rulers of this part of the country, is also still perceptible in the language. This dialect is perhaps richer than any other in national songs.⁴⁰ Many of them are of

⁴⁰ A very valuable collection has been recently prepared by M. Maximovitch, *Malo-rossiskaja pesni*, Moscow 1829. An older one, published in 1819 by prince Tzertelef, contains only eight songs.

peculiar beauty, touching *naïveté*, and a poetical truth which far outshines all artificial decorations. The greater part of these songs have an elegiac character; as is the case indeed with most productions of the common people. The dialect itself, however, is far from being less adapted to the expression of the comic. There exists in it a travesty of the *Eneid*, written by J. Kottjarovsky, a *hetman* of the Cossaks, if we are not misinformed, which has found great applause throughout all Russia, although a foreigner is less able to appreciate its peculiarities and beauties; since all poetic excellence indeed of a comic description, can be felt only by those who are familiar not only with the poetic language, but also with all those minute local and historical circumstances, the allusion to which contributes so frequently to augment the ludicrous.

Essentially the same with the Malo-Russian is the idiom of the *Rusniaks* in the eastern part of Galicia and the north-eastern districts of Hungary; and the few variations which occur in it have not yet been sufficiently investigated. Comparatively little attention has been paid to this branch of the Slavic race; and their beautiful national songs, scattered among a widely extended people, still await a tasteful and judicious collector.

3. The *White-Russian* is the dialect spoken in Lithuania and a portion of White Russia, especially Volhynia. The situation of these provinces sufficiently accounts for its being full of *Polisms*. All the historical documents of Lithuania are written in this dialect; and several Russian writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries employed it in preference to the Old Slavonic. It is the youngest of the Russian dialects.

What first strikes us in considering the Russian language as a whole, is its immense copiousness. The *early* influence of foreign nations appears here as a decided advantage. The German, in the highest degree susceptible for foreign *ideas* and *forms of thought*, repels nevertheless all foreign *words* and *forms of expression* as unnatural excrescences. It is evidently disfigured by the adoption of foreign words, and can preserve its beauty only by adhering to its own national and inexhaustible *sources*. The Russian, having been in early times successively subjected to the influence of the Scandinavian, Mongolian, Tartar, and Polish languages, is in this respect to be compared, in a certain measure, with the English, in which the ancient British, the Latin, the Saxon, the Danish and the French amalgamated in the same proportion as the ideas of these different nations

were adopted. Hence nothing that ever contributed to the singular composition of this rich language, appears to be borrowed; but all belongs to it as its lawful property. But the great pre-eminence of the Russian appears in the *use* which it made of these adopted treasures. Its greater flexibility made it capable of employing foreign words merely as *roots*, from which it raised stems and branches by means of its own native resources. It is this copiousness and variety of *radical* syllables, which gives to the Russian a claim over all other Slavic languages.

Another excellence is the great freedom of construction which it allows, without any danger of becoming unintelligible or even ambiguous. It resembles in this point the classic languages; from which however its small number of conjunctions decidedly distinguishes it. This want of conjunctions has been objected to the language as a defect; it seems however to be one of the causes, why it is so remarkably clear and distinct; since it can only admit of comparatively short phrases. In spite of this clearness, its adaptedness for poetry is undeniable; and in this branch the incomparable national songs extant in it, would afford a most noble foundation even in respect to forms, if nature could ever obtain a complete victory over the perverted taste of fashion. Whether this language is really capable of entirely imitating the classic metres, is still a matter of dispute among distinguished Slavic philologists.* As to its euphony, what has been said above in respect to the Slavic languages in general, may be applied particularly to the Russian. Here however the ear of the unprejudiced listener alone can decide.

FIRST PERIOD.

To the coming of age of Peter the Great, 1689.

The influence of the Varegians in respect to the language, appears to have been inconsiderable; their own idiom on the contrary being soon absorbed by that of the natives. Rurik's grandsons had already Slavic names.† The principal event in those ancient times, and one which manifested its beneficent consequences in respect to civilization here, as everywhere, was the introduction of Christianity, towards the end of the tenth

* See Schaffarik p. 178, note 4.

† Sviatoslav, Jaropulk, Jaroslav, etc.

century. Vladimir the Great, the first Christian monarch, founded the first schools; Greek artists were called from Constantinople to embellish the newly erected churches at Kief; and poetry found a patron and at the same time her hero in Vladimir. Vladimir and his knights are the Russian Charlemagne and his peers, king Arthur and his round table. Their deeds and exploits have proved a rich source for the popular tales and songs of posterity, and serve even now to give to the earlier age of Russian history a tinge of that romantic charm, of which the history of the middle ages is so utterly void and poor. The establishment of Christianity was followed by the introduction of Cyril's translation of the Scriptures and the liturgical books. The kindred language of these writings was intelligible to them; but was still distinct enough from the old Russian, to permit them to exist side by side as two different languages; the one fixed and immovable, the voice of the Scriptures, the priests, and the laws; the other varying, advancing, expanding, adapting itself to the progress of time. That this latter, the genuine old Russian, had its poets, was, until the close of the last century, only known by historical tradition; no monument of them seemed to be left. But at that time, A. D. 1794, a Russian nobleman, Count Mussin-Pushkin, discovered the manuscript of an epic poem, 'Igor's Expedition against the Polovtsi,' apparently not older than the twelfth century. It is a piece of national poetry of the highest beauty, united with an equal share of power and gracefulness. But what strikes us even more than this, is, that we find in it no trace of that rudeness, which would naturally be expected in the production of a period when darkness still covered all eastern Europe, and of a poet belonging to a nation, which we have hardly longer than a century ceased to consider as barbarians! There hovers a spirit of meekness over the whole, which sometimes even seems to endanger the energy of the representation. The truth is, that the Russians enjoyed at this early period a higher degree of mental cultivation than almost any other part of Europe. There were several writers even among their princes. Jaroslav, the son of Vladimir the Great, was not less active than his father had been in advancing the cause of Christianity, and all that stands in connexion with religion. He sent priests throughout the whole country to instruct the people, and founded in Novogorod a theological seminary for three hundred students. He took care that the translation of the church books was continued; but the most

remarkable monument of his reign, as well in an historical as in a philological respect, is the *Pravda Russka*, a collection of laws.⁴¹ Another grand duke of Russia, Vladimir Vsevolodovich Monomach, who died in 1125, wrote 'Instructions for his Children;' one of his successors, Constantine Vsevolodovich, a hundred years later, produced a history of the Russian princes, which is now lost. The clergy, safe in their cells from the tempests of war, were busy in translating from the Greek; Nestor wrote his valuable annals;* another priest, Basilus, described the cotemporary events in the south of Russia; Sylvester, bishop of Perejaslavl, d. 1124, and several others of the clergy, continued Nestor's annals;⁴² while Hegumen Daniel wrote his Travels to Palestine in the beginning of the twelfth century.

The theological productions of the early portion of this period, are of less value than the historical. It was however this field, that was cultivated most diligently. There are several sermons, or rather synodal *oraisons*, still extant; some of which, by another Cyril, metropolitan of Kief, A. D. 1281, are not without real eloquence. Most of the productions of this early period, which belong indeed more to the history of the Slavonic than of the Russian literature, perished in the devastations and conflagration of the Mongols.

From A. D. 1238 to 1462, the Russian princes, as we have seen, were vassals of the Mongol Tartars, or the *Golden Horde*.⁴³ In the course of these two centuries, nearly every

⁴¹ *Pravda Russka*, Jus Russorum. See above, note 34.

* See above, p. 355.

⁴² These valuable chronicles were continued under different titles, but without interruption, until the reign of Alexis, father of Peter I.

⁴³ The Mongols and Tartars have been frequently confounded by historical writers: they are however two races perfectly distinct from each other, the first a North-Eastern, the second a South-Western Asiatic nation. The Mongols however, between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, conquerors of the Tartars as well as of half Asia, and of Europe as far as Silesia, and comparatively only small in number, amalgamated gradually with the subjugated Tartars among whom they settled. The present Mongols are partly under the sovereignty of China in the ancient Mongolia, the country from whence Jenghis Khan came; partly Russian subjects, scattered through the government of Irkutsk, and mixed with Kalmucks and other Asiatic tribes.

tree of cultivation perished. No school existed during this whole time throughout all Russia. The Mongols set fire to the cities; sought out and destroyed what written documents they could find; and purposely demolished all monuments of national culture. The convents alone found in their policy a sort of protection. Science therefore became more than ever the exclusive possession of the monks. Among these, however, no trace of classical learning, and hardly a show of scholastic wisdom, was to be found. Fortunately they improved their time as well in respect to posterity by writing annals, as for their own personal benefit by accumulating wealth.

The re-establishment of Russian independence in the middle of the fifteenth century, had a reviving influence on national science and literature. The nation however had been too long kept back, ever to be able to overtake their western neighbours. From this point a new division of this period begins. Most of the Russian princes were men of powerful and active minds; they invited artists and physicians from Greece, Italy, and Germany, into their country, and rewarded them liberally. Ivan IV,⁴⁴ A. D. 1533—84, ordered schools to be founded in all the cities of his empire; under his reign the first printing-office was established in Moscow in 1564. Soon afterwards a theological academy was founded at Kief. Boris Godunof, 1598—1605, sent eighteen noble youth to study at foreign universities. The princes of the house of Romanof shewed themselves not less active. Alexei and Fedor, the father and brother of Peter the Great, opened the way for that bold reformer, and appear as his worthy predecessors; indeed the merit of several improvements which have been generally ascribed to Peter, belongs to them. During this whole later period, the Polish language and literature exerted a decided influence on the Russian; and some writers began to use the dialect of White Russia, an impure mixture of the two,⁴⁵ while the pure Russian was despised as merely fit for vulgar use. This latter began only in the last half of the seventeenth century, to shake off these chains and acquire for itself an independent form.

The first germs of dramatic art were likewise carried from Poland to Russia. In Kief, the theological students performed

⁴⁴ Also called Ivan II, and Ivan the Cruel; by modern historians the Russian Nero.

⁴⁵ See above, p. 361.

ecclesiastical dramas; and travelled about during the holidays, to exhibit their skill in other cities. The scenes which they had to repeat most frequently, were the three children in the fiery furnace, and Haman's execution. The tragedies of Simeon of Polotzk, in the Old Slavic language, had great success in the middle of the seventeenth century. Their renown penetrated from the convents to the court; where they were performed before Tzar Fedor, the predecessor of Peter.⁴⁶ His minister, Matveyef, the Slavic Mæcenas of his time, and himself a writer, invited the first stage-players to Russia; and at his instigation, the first secular drama, a translation of Molière's "*Médecin malgré lui*," was played before the gratified princesses and their enraptured maids of honour.

This latter portion of the first period, poor as it is, has nevertheless several books of travels to exhibit. A merchant of Tver, Athanasius Nikitin, travelled in the year 1470 to India, visited the Dekkan and Golconda, and gave on his return a description of those countries. Two other merchants of Moscow, Korobeinikof and Grekof, described a century later their travels through Syria, Palestine and Egypt. Fedor Baikof, Russian envoy to China, published likewise a book of travels in this remarkable country.

In the department of history, this portion of the first period was surprisingly productive. Not only were the Annals of the venerable Nestor, the basis of all Slavic history, continued by the monks with fidelity and zeal; but a whole series of other annals, biographies of single princes, and chronographies, were produced; and even some foreign nations received their share of attention.⁴⁷ The reader however must not expect to find a vestige of philosophical genius, nor a philosophical representation of the events. Entirely unacquainted with classical literature, the Greek writers of the Byzantine age were their only models.

⁴⁶ Most of these dramas are extant in manuscript in the synodal library at Moscow. A selection has been printed in the *Drevn. Russisk. Bibliotheka*, i. e. Old Russian Library, Moscow 1818.

⁴⁷ The above mentioned chronicles, and another series of annals of a genealogical character, known under the title *Stepennaja Knigi*, mutually supply each other. Simon of Suzdal, the metropolitan Cyprian, a Servian by birth, and Macarius, metropolitan of Moscow, a clergyman of great merits, are to be named here. Another old chronicle called *Sofiiskii Wremenik* was first published in 1820 by Stroyef.

The best that can be expected is a dry and faithful narrative of facts.⁴⁸

The weakest part of the literature of this later period, a sketch of which however seems more appropriate here than any other, is the theological branch. It is true that the *Improvement* of the old church books, was executed with much zeal; but in what spirit this was done, in a philological respect, we have mentioned above in the history of the Old Slavonic literature, to which the labours of the translators properly belong. Nikon, patriarch of Russia, d. 1681, carried on this work with the greatest activity; and besides this set on foot a collection of historical annals.⁴⁹ The light of the Reformation, which at that time spread its beneficent beams over all Europe, and had particularly such a strong influence on Poland, did not penetrate into the night of the Russian church; the gloom of which, however, had always been mitigated by a spirit of meekness and christian love. Still, we notice among the pulpit productions of this time somewhat of the polemic genius of the age. It was not, however, against the bold innovations of Lutherans or Calvinists, that the clergy found occasion to turn their weapons, but against the Jewish *heresy*!⁵⁰ A translation of the Psalms of David, Moscow 1680, deserves to be distinguished among similar productions. The writer was the monk Simeon of Polotzk, author of the above-mentioned spiritual dramas, and instructor of the Tzar Fedor. Still more remarkable is the first attempt to translate the Bible into the Russian dialect. Francis Skorina, the translator, likewise a native

⁴⁸ There is, however, in the style of Nestor and his immediate successors, a certain endeavour after animation. Speeches and dialogues are introduced, and pious reflections and biblical sentences are scattered through the whole.

⁴⁹ Known under the title: *Nikonov spisok*, published St. Petersburg 1767—92, 8 vols. For the *Improvement* of the Slavonic Bible, Nikon alone, by applying to the Patriarch of Constantinople and other Greek dignitaries, obtained 500 Greek MSS. of the whole or portions of the N. Test. Some of them contained also the Septuagint. These were mostly from Mount Athos, and are now the celebrated Moscow MSS. collated by Matthæi. See Henderson, p. 52, 53.

⁵⁰ Joseph Sanin, a monk, wrote a history of the Jewish heresy in the fifteenth century, and a series of sermons against it. This last was also done by the bishop of Novogorod, Gennadius. The Russian church had a zealous advocate in the archbishop Lazar Baranovitch, d. 1693.

of Polotsk, where the Polish influence was stronger than in any other quarter, was a doctor of medicine; but the time had now come when it began to be felt over all Europe, that the holy volume did not belong exclusively to the clergy. Some parts only of his translation have been printed.⁵¹

In the course of the sixteenth century, several printing offices had been established in Russia, almost exclusively for the benefit of theological works; since nearly all historical writings were preserved in manuscript, and have been first printed in modern times. The awkward appearance of Cyril's alphabet, seemed to add an unnecessary difficulty to the diffusion of the knowledge of reading. Towards the end of the seventeenth century Elias Kopiovitch made some improvement in the appearance of the Slavic letters; it was however reserved to Peter's reforming hand, to give to them a fixed and permanent shape.

SECOND PERIOD.

From the majority of Peter the Great, A. D. 1689, to Lomonosof, A. D. 1741.

The history of the genuine Russian literature begins only with the adoption of the language of the people for all civil writings. It was Peter the Great, who raised this language to be the language of public business, in which all transactions of the courts of justice henceforth were to be held, and all ordinances to be issued. Ere this great man was able to establish a Russian printing office in his own empire, in order not to lose time, he gave a privilege for fifteen years to the Dutch printer Tessing for Russian works. It was in Amsterdam, in 1699, that the first Russian book was printed. About the year 1704, Peter himself invented some alterations in the Slavic letters, principally so as to make them more similar to the Latin. He caused a fount of these new types to be cast by Dutch artists; and the first Russian newspaper was printed with them at St. Petersburg in 1705. These letters, with some additional alterations during the course of the following ten years, were generally adopted for the Rus-

⁵¹ A part of the O. T. Prague 1517—19; the Acts and Epistles, Vilna 1525. Skorina, in one of his prefaces, found it necessary to excuse his meddling with holy things by the example of St. Luke, who, he says, was of the same profession. The dialect of this translation is the White Russian; and the book of Job contains the first specimen of Russian *rhymed* poetry.

sim language, and are in use at the present time. The same letters, with a few slight variations, are also used by that portion of the Servians who belong to the eastern church; the other portion making use of the Latin alphabet. In all theological writings, however, the ancient forms of the letters are preserved. This is the difference between the *grashdankii* and *tzerkvennii*, or the civil and church alphabet.⁵²

The energy with which this emperor, a *real autocrat*, proceeded, caused his people to overleap a whole century. If there is something revolting to a liberal mind in the despotic haste with which he deprived a great nation at once of a part of their nationality, through his arbitrary decision in all that he deemed best for them, still it serves greatly to allay this feeling, to observe that the resistance which he experienced, did not proceed from the people, but almost exclusively from the obstinate pride of a spoiled nobility, and the narrow-minded policy of an ignorant and jealous priesthood. The Russian nation itself is indeed, more than any other people, susceptible of deep impressions. Hence they are in general not averse to innovations; and were in Peter's time, as now, willing to be conducted by a hand acknowledged as that of a superior. In consequence of these very national qualities, good or bad, they are capable of being readily moulded into any new form.

Whether the rapidity, nay, vehemence of the Tzar's improvements were a real benefit to the nation, this is not the place to examine; but for the free developement of the language and literature, it is evident that his proceedings were injurious, notwithstanding their apparently wonderful effect. Although the language possesses all the elements of perfection, and notwithstanding the not inconsiderable mass of talent which has developed itself in the course of time, the Russian literature has not yet produced a single work of great and decided *original* value. The best works which they have, are imitations, and he is the most distinguished writer whose discernment leads him to choose the best model. There is no doubt, the present standing of the Russian literature *in general* would have been much lower, and its extent especially would have been much smaller, than it now

⁵² The Russians, however, out of the forty-six characters of the Slavonic alphabet, could make use only of thirty-five; the Servians, according to Vuk Stephanovitch, only of twenty-eight.

is, had the Russian genius been permitted to break its own way through the darkness ; but there is still less doubt, that in this case it would have preserved its original peculiarity, that wonderful blending of the East and the West, of Asiatic suppleness and European energy, of which their popular songs give such affecting, and in some cases, powerful specimens.⁵³

Peter, without delay, caused many books to be translated into Russian, from the German, French, English, and Dutch languages. The haste however with which this was performed, and the greater attention of the Tzar to the *matter* than to the *form*, had the natural consequence, that most of these translations were miserable productions, executed without the least regard for the language itself. Peter's only object was to enable his subjects to become a *reading people*, and to communicate to them useful knowledge through the medium of books. Beauties of style, and even mere purity of language, belong in a certain measure to the luxuries of literature ; the Tzar thought only of utility.

These innovations in literature found of course a great many opponents among the clergy ; but there were some enlightened priests among those who held the highest standing in the church, who favoured in general the Tzar's plan. The field of theology became somewhat more cultivated during this period. Theophan Prokovitch, archbishop of Novogorod, d. 1736, alone wrote sixty works, of which however only about half were printed. He was Peter's faithful assistant ; and not only his

⁵³ The Russians are particularly rich in *nursery tales*, preserved only by tradition, and written down in modern times. The attention of the Russian literati has been but recently directed to this subject. The reader who wishes for information on this part of Slavic literature, will find a survey of it in Schaffarik's *History of the Slavic Literature*, p. 140. n. 1.—There have however appeared several valuable collections in this department, since the publication of that work. An English collection of translations of Russian *popular poetry* is not known to us, with the exception of the pieces contained in Bowring's *Russian Anthology*, which may give to the reader a taste of their prevailing beauty. Whoever understands German, will be gratified with the works : *Fürst Vladimir und seine Tafelrunde*, Lpzg. 1819. *Stimmen des Russischen Volks*, by Goetze, Stuttgart 1825. *Prinz Tzertelef's Geist der Russ. Poesie*, etc. Leipz. 1822. *Dietrich's Russische Volksmärchen gesammelt*, etc. Leipz. 1831.

learning and mental gifts, but his moral excellence, gained him a decided influence. He was usually styled the Russian Chrysostom.

The metropolitan of Rostof, called the holy Demetrius, d. 1709, was likewise a very productive theological writer. He was considered by his cotemporaries as a true pattern of Christianity; and was equally distinguished for his learning. The metropolitan Stephen Javorsky, d. 1722, was celebrated for his eloquence in the pulpit. Gabriel Bushinsky, bishop of Rjazan and Murom, d. 1731, was not only a theological writer, but translated also works on history. A remarkable example in this period, is Elias Kopyievsky,⁵⁴ d. 1701, who studied theology in Holland, and became a protestant, and afterwards a pastor at Amsterdam. He aided zealously in Peter's great work of translations. Several historical and philological works translated by him, were published by Tessing. Luther's Catechism was translated about the same time by the pastor Glück of Livonia, who had been made a prisoner by the Russians and carried to Moscow. It was in his house that Catharine, the future empress of Russia, was brought up.⁵⁵

Among the secular writers of this period, prince Antiochus Kantemir, d. 1745, must above all be mentioned. Of Greek extraction, and born in Constantinople, with all the advantages of an accomplished education, and in full possession of several highly cultivated languages, he nevertheless chose the Russian idiom for his poetical productions. These are mostly satires, and evidently bear the stamp of a thorough knowledge of the classics. Besides these he wrote on different subjects of natural philosophy; and translated a selection from the Epistles of Horace, and Fontenelle's work on the plurality of worlds.

Among the lyric poets, two Cossaks, Cyril Danilof, and Semen Klimofsky, are named with some distinction. Leont. Magnitzky wrote the first Russian Arithmetic with Arabic numerals. In historical contributions this period is likewise not poor; but as the writers did not pay the slightest attention to style, or did

⁵⁴ Or *Kopyievitch*, the same whom we have mentioned as having improved the appearance of the alphabet.

⁵⁵ The same Glück had translated the Gospels into Lettonian, and made also an attempt to furnish the Russians with a version of the Scriptures in their vulgar tongue. The detail may be read in Henderson's Researches, p. 111.

not know from what principles to begin, the language remained entirely uncultivated. There was as yet no thought of a Russian *Grammar*. In poetry the system of rhymed verses, in which the syllables were not measured, but counted, in imitation of the Poles, reigned exclusively. Meanwhile the popular songs held faithfully to the old Russian irregular but highly musical numbers, consulting only the ear. Trediakofsky, born 1703, was the first who examined more closely the nature of the language, and advised the adoption of the classical metres founded on quantity. He applied on this point merely the principles which Zizania and Smotrisky nearly a century before had established for the Old Slavic idiom, and with equal propriety. But as the talent for illustrating his rules by good examples, was wanting in him, he made very little impression; and his name and endeavours were soon forgotten.⁵⁶

THIRD PERIOD.

From Lomonosof to Karamzin, A. D. 1741—1796.

We have now reached the epoch from which the temple of Russian literature, as it appears at present, must be dated. It was Peter's hand that laid the corner stone; it was Lomonosof who raised it above the ground; whilst the fortunate turns of Elizabeth's and Catharine's vanity caused it to be filled with more worshippers than would otherwise ever have sought the way thither. Academies were founded for the sciences and arts; numerous institutions for the education of all classes and ages were created and endowed with true imperial magnificence. In the year 1758 the university of Moscow was founded; while other scientific institutions of all descriptions were established by Catharine's unbounded liberality. In the year 1783 the free establishment of printing offices was permitted; of course not without reserving to the government the privilege of a strict cen-

⁵⁶ A catalogue of all the works of this most productive writer is contained in *Opyt istorii Russkoi literatury*, Historical Sketch of the Russian literature, in the fourth volume of his *Uchebnaya kniga russ. slavesosti*, or Manual of Russian Literature, St. Petersburg, 1819-22. As a characteristic of this poet, we mention only that the empress Catharine in her social parties used to inflict as a punishment, for the little sins against propriety committed there, i. e. bad humour, passionate disputing, etc. the task of learning by heart and reciting a number of Trediakofsky's verses.

sorship. A seminary for educating teachers for popular schools was erected; with the intention of founding Gymnasias all over the country. These measures, no doubt, had an essential and beneficial influence on the general civilization of the nation. But the common people, the peasantry, remained entirely neglected.

It was however in a family of the lowest standing, that Michael Lomonosof was born, A. D. 1711. His father was a fisherman in the government of Archangel. During the long winters, when his father's trade was interrupted, Lomonosof learned to read of one of the church servants. The beauties of the Bible, and the singing of the Psalms during the church service, in the rhymed translation of Simeon of Polotzk, first awakened his own poetical faculties. An ardent desire for an education caused him to leave home privately and seek his way to Moscow, where, he was told, was an institution, in which foreign languages were taught. Circumstances proved fortunate; he found liberal patrons, was educated afterwards in Kief and St. Petersburg, and obtained means to go to Germany. Here he connected philosophy with the mathematical studies which he had hitherto chiefly pursued; devoted a part of his time to the science of mining, at the celebrated school in Freiburg; and sat in Marburg at the feet of the philosopher Wolf. In passing through Brunswick, he escaped with difficulty the horrors of the Prussian military system. He succeeded in reaching Holland, and thence returned to his own country; where he was well received and honourably employed by the government. He died A. D. 1765, in the enjoyment of high general esteem, but not that degree of reputation which has been allotted to him by a more judicious posterity. He first ventured to draw a distinct boundary line between the Old Slavic and the Russian languages; which hitherto had been confounded in a most intolerable manner. In his Russian Grammar he first laid down principles, and fixed rules for the general compass of the language, without however checking the influence of the Church Slavonic more than was necessary, in order to preserve the identity of the former. He wrote a sketch of Russian History, a long epic poem called the *Petreide*, speeches, odes, tragedies, and several works on chemistry and mineralogy. None of his productions are without merit; but he was more a man of sagacity and strong talent, than of poetical genius. His poems are all cold and artificial, excepting perhaps his version of a few chapters of the

book of Job, where the beauties of the original appear to have inspired him. His speeches and odes are written in the same style of panegyric, which then reigned, and which reigns still, in all the creations of Russian poetry or prose having the least reference to the imperial family; and which, in connexion with the boastful style of all productions purporting to describe national deeds, is a real blemish in the Russian literature, adapted to render it disgusting to all foreigners.⁵⁷

The two most celebrated writers among Lomonosof's contemporaries, though somewhat younger than he, were Alexander Sumarokof, d. 1777, and Michael Kheraskof, b. 1733, d. 1807. Both were very productive writers in prose and poetry, overwhelming the reading public with tragedies and comedies, odes and epistles; and the latter also with two long epic poems, one in twelve, and the other in eighteen cantos! Both were highly admired, and the overflowings of their pens were devoured with avidity. Kheraskof was called the Russian Homer. The childhood, in which Russian literature then was, is not the age of criticism; sounder judges of later times have allotted to those productions a place hardly above mediocrity.

The first Russian theatre was instituted in Jaroslav, A. D. 1746. The permission, which the actors obtained A. D. 1754, to establish themselves in St. Petersburg, and still more the foundation of a national stage in Moscow in 1759, served much to awaken the decided dramatic talent of the Russians; a faculty in which they are perhaps incomparable, and certainly are not surpassed by any other nation. Several gifted literary men employed themselves in writing for the stage. Such were J. Knjashnin, d. 1791, an imitator of the French, but not without talent of his own; Von Wisin, d. 1792, the author of two comedies, full of genuine comic power; Maïkof, Nicolef, Klushin, etc. The distinguished productions of Von Wisin alone have continued to hold possession of the stage.⁵⁸

As the most prominent poets of a miscellaneous character the following may be mentioned: Hippolit Bagdanovitch, b. 1743,

⁵⁷ Lomonosof's works were first collected and published by the Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg, 1803, 6 vols. in several editions.

⁵⁸ His masterpiece, *Nedorosl*, 'Mama's Darling,' literally *the Minor*, published 1787, presents an incomparable picture of the manners, habits, etc. of the Russian country gentry.

d. 1805, author of a tale in verse; *Psyche*, not without gracefulness and *naïveté*; Chemnitz, d. 1784, the writer of the best Russian fables; Gabriel Derzhavin, b. 1743, d. 1816, the most celebrated Russian poet of his time. The glory of Catherine II, and of the Russian army, was his favourite theme; but even the panegyrical style of his odes, the most dangerous enemy not only of moral, but likewise of poetical truth, cannot destroy the power of his truly poetical genius. His ode *To God* has obtained the distinction of being translated not only into several European languages, but also into Chinese, and hung up in the emperor's palace, printed with golden letters on white silk.⁵⁰ Further, Vasilii Kapnist, b. 1756, d. 1823, who as a lyrical poet stands next to Derzhavin; Bobrof, familiarly acquainted with English literature, which he endeavoured to imitate, full of imagination, but bombastic and obscure; Prince Dolgoruky, distinguished by a philosophical vein; Neledinsky-Meletsky, whose songs are known even by the lower classes.

During this period also the field of translation was not less cultivated. Kostrof translated the *Iliad* in rhymed verses, A. D. 1787, and also Macpherson's *Ossian* from the French. Petrof gave a version of the *Eneid* in 1793. Bulgakof first made the Russian public acquainted with Ariosto; Popovsky with Pope and Locke, etc.—As a man of general and favourable influence on literature, we must not forget to name N. Novikov, editor of several periodical journals, and author of the first Russian bibliographical work.*

The patriotism which caused the Russians ever to pay a certain degree of attention to their national history, deserves the highest praise. During all periods of their literature, this branch has been attended to with diligence. It is however especially the laborious collection and faithful preservation of materials, for which posterity is indebted to them; since there is little of a philosophical spirit to be found in their arrangement of these materials; and in regard to the language in which they are presented, it is striking to observe how the Russian prose was always far behind the Russian poetry. G. F. Müller, d. 1783, a German by birth, but who devoted all his life to Russian literature,

⁵⁰ Also into Japanese, according to Golovnin's account, and suspended in like manner in the temple of Jeddo. See Bowring's *Russ. Anthol.* I. p. 3.

* See below, in Note 61.

published the first Russian periodical, devoted chiefly to historical objects.⁶⁰ He also caused several old manuscripts to be printed; and added greatly to their value by his investigations and commentaries. Prince Shtcherbatof wrote fifteen volumes of Russian history, besides several smaller works,—a mere collection of facts, but rendered more important by a review and criticism upon them by Boltin, d. 1792, a distinguished historian. Tchulkof wrote a history of commerce; Jemin, Rytchkof, Golikof, and others, wrote on particular portions of Russian history.

For the philological studies of the language, the foundation of the Russian Academy, A. D. 1783, was of great importance. A standard grammar and etymological dictionary were published by it in 1787—90, founded on a plan perfectly new, and in the merit of which the empress Catharine had no small personal share. Her example awakened not a few Mæcenas among the *magnates* of the country; and it became a point of high ambition to favour literature and literary men.

We turn at length to that branch which here concerns us more than any other, the state of theological and biblical science; and in glancing at the meagre sketch which it presents, the reader will easily perceive, why we have deferred it to the last. Hardly any thing interesting, certainly nothing gratifying, meets our eye in this vast, deserted field. Except a few didactic works on dogmatics and rhetoric, several catechisms and similar productions, this department is limited exclusively to sermons, or rather synodal discourses. There is not always a want of talent, and sometimes even a rich share of natural power; but the language, though first developed in similar productions, is here so full of bombastic, tasteless, and mere rhetorical ornaments, that the *thought* seems to be entirely drowned in them.

Demetrius Sjetchinof, metropolitan of Novogorod, d. 1767, and the archbishop of White Russia, Konissky, d. 1795, are considered as not being without eloquence. Platon Levshin, metropolitan of Moscow, was the most productive of the eccle-

⁶⁰ This was a monthly periodical, first published 1755. The list of Germans whose labours have proved of the highest importance to Russia is very long; among them are those of Pallas, Schlözer, Frähn, Krug, etc. The department of statistics has been exclusively cultivated by Germans, Livonians, etc. and all that the Russians have done in the philological and historical departments, rests on the preceding solid and profound labours of German scholars.

siastical writers. He died in 1812, and continued to write until the end of his life; his productions consequently, in respect to time, belong partly to the last period of Russian literature.* Anastasius Bratanofski, archbishop of Astrachan, d. 1806, takes the first place among Russian ecclesiastical orators, in respect to style and command of language; though higher powers and profounder feelings are ascribed to an arch-priest of Kief, Ivan Levanda, d. 1814. Here our catalogue terminates. All the remaining ecclesiastical writers of any distinction, although only a few years younger than those here mentioned, seem in respect to language to belong to the following period.⁶¹

FOURTH PERIOD.

From Karamzin, A. D. 1796, to the present time.

The number of Russian writers increases during this period so considerably, that we feel more than ever obliged to limit ourselves to the most distinguished; thus no doubt passing over in silence many a name, more deserving to be mentioned than others of the preceding periods, which borrowed a comparative lustre only from the poverty of the times.

The emperor Alexander, during the first years of his reign, showed a zeal for the mental cultivation and enlightening of his subjects, which presented him to the eyes of admiring Europe in the light of one of the great benefactors of mankind. Who-

* His *Summary of Christian Divinity* has been translated by Dr Pinkerton, and published in his "Present State of the Greek church in Russia."

⁶¹ A more complete list of Russian theological writers and their productions, is to be found in the metropolitan Eugene's *Slovar o istorichesky byshich v. Rossii pisateljach duchovn. tchina*, or 'Historical Dictionary of all Russian writers belonging to the clerical order,' St. Pet. 1818. For a more general knowledge of the Russian literature, the following works may be recommended: Gretsch *Opyt kratkoi istorii russk. literaturi*, St. Pet. 1822. Novikof's *Opyt istoricheskovo slovarja*, etc. St. Pet. 1772. Sopikof's *Opyt russk. bibliografii*, St. Pet. 1813—21, 5 vols. Anastasevitch *Rospis ross. knig. etc.* St. Pet. 1820. This last work contains the first systematical catalogue of all Russian books. Farther: Tzertelef's *Istoricheskaja kartina ross. slovesnosti*, 1809. P. Koeppen's *Materialii dlja istorii prosvjeshn. v. Rossii*, 1819. The latest Russian bibliographical work in the German language is Strahl's *Gelehrtes Russland*, Lpz. 1828, founded principally on the Bibliographical Dictionary of Eugenius mentioned above.

ever will take the trouble to follow the career of this prince closely, and contrast the shouts of acclamation with which the world hailed him at first, with the disesteem into which the same individual a few years afterwards shrunk, as a weak and insignificant being,—and then again compare the enthusiasm with which during the time of his better fortunes he was received anew as the deliverer of Europe, with the part which was afterwards assigned him in the system of *obscurantismus* supposed to be adopted by the united sovereigns of Europe,—whoever considers all this, cannot but be struck with the small portion of discernment and discrimination which is manifested in the world. A sober and keen-sighted observer might have seen even in the beginning, glorious as it was, that not all is gold that glitters. All that was done, was accompanied with a noise and boasting which strangely imposed upon foreigners. Universities, on the plan of the venerable institutions of learning in Germany, were founded, where all the preparation necessary in order to profit by them was wanting; and the profoundest sciences were professedly taught to pupils, who were still deficient even in elementary knowledge. We do not however mean to say, that much real good was not done; and even if some of the new institutions were not propitious in their immediate results, still the time has come, or will come, when all of them are or will be at least in a measure useful. The establishment of numerous common schools of a less elevated character throughout the whole empire, deserves unqualified praise. More than fifty higher schools, called gymnasia, or governmental schools, and twice as many lower or provincial schools, were established under Alexander's reign alone.⁶² Besides the universities, seven in all, of which Alexander founded five, there are a considerable number of professional schools; among which are four theological academies. In the year 1823, an Institution for the study of oriental languages was founded at St. Petersburg; and in 1829 a similar one at Odessa, a city which has by its location more natural advantages for the learning of Asiatic languages than any other, and where for most of them native teachers may be readily obtained. On the other hand, the Asiatic Museum attached to the school at St. Petersburg contains all the means and aids for those studies

⁶² A survey of the number and general classification of the universities and schools in Russia, is to be found in the American Quarterly Observer for Jan. 1834, Vol. II. No. 1.

to be met with at a more remote place. Richly endowed by the munificence of the emperor Alexander, who caused scientific treasures of every kind to be liberally purchased, it was also greatly augmented during the late war with Persia ; where by order of the emperor all conquered cities were deprived of their libraries, whether public or private ; while by a stipulation in the treaty of peace, the Persian government was compelled to deliver to Russia towards four hundred manuscripts, a list of which was drawn up by the orientalists Frähn and Senkofsky. Among these were the geography of Ptolemy, and several Arabic translations of Greek and Latin works, lost in the original languages. Although the object of the oriental schools in Russia was originally to educate translators for diplomatic missions, they have proved themselves very useful to oriental philology in general ; especially through the many gifted Germans in the Russian service, who avail themselves gladly of opportunities for those studies which their own country cannot give. It will however be seen in the sequel, that several learned Russians also have paid an honourable attention to this branch.

The Russian Bible Society, founded A. D. 1813, was at first patronized by the emperor. Under its auspices, and at the instigation of the emperor himself, there was prepared a version of the Scriptures into the Russian dialect. In the year 1820, not less than 50,000 copies of the Gospels and the Acts were issued from the press ; in 1823 the whole New Testament was finished, and in the course of eight months 20,000 copies were distributed. For this translation the peasantry, to whom the Old Slavonic church Bible was only half intelligible, shewed such an eagerness, as soon to excite trouble among the clergy. In some of the governments, remote from the capital, the readers of this version of the Bible had to encounter serious persecution. In respect to translations into foreign languages, a kind of rivalry arose between the parent society in England, and the daughter in St. Petersburg. Besides the preparation by the latter of translations into *thirty-one* different languages and dialects within the limits of the Russian empire, she likewise took care of several Asiatic nations, and founded auxiliaries in the deserts of Siberia, and also in the midst of the Cossaks of the Don and the Circassian provinces. In A. D. 1820, this society had fifty-three sections and 145 auxiliaries ; and the number of copies of whole Bibles and of New Testaments distributed, exceeded 430,000. But in 1822, the society held its last anniversary ; and three

years later, some of the more important Russian clergy succeeded in closing the series of annual reports. In April 1826, the activity of the society was ultimately terminated, or, as it was expressed, *was suspended*, by the Ukase of the emperor Nicholas, at the instigation of the metropolitans Eugene and Seraphim. Since that time, only the sale of the copies already printed, has been permitted.⁶³

The Russian Bible Society stood of course in connexion with societies for Foreign Missions; but was active in this respect chiefly through the agency of the United or Moravian Brethren. In 1823 the Moravians of Sarepta sent, with the express consent of the minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, two missionaries to the Kalmuks; into whose language the Gospels had been translated at St. Petersburg by Schmidt. In the same degree that they found the people susceptible for divine truth, did they meet with opposition from the priesthood. The Khans, yielding to the influence of the priests, threatened to emigrate; and the Russian government found it advisable to withdraw the mission. An interesting report of this mission was published in 1824, in the *Journal of St. Petersburg*. In the year 1824, a mission of the Greek church, at the instigation of the bishop of Archangel, was sent to the Samoyedes. This was the first attempt ever made to convert that savage people to Christianity; of the results we are not informed.

The compass of Russian literature extended itself during the course of Alexander's reign, or rather from A. D. 1800 to 1822, with a most remarkable rapidity. In the year 1787 the number of books written in the Old Slavonic and Russian dialects, did not exceed 4000; ⁶⁴ before 1820 twice that number was counted; the year 1820 alone produced 3400 works, 800 of them translations from the French, 483 from the German, and more than 100 from the English. Sopikof, in his bibliographical essay,* enumerates the titles of 13,249 Russian and Slavonic books, printed in Russia from A. D. 1553 to 1823. But at this time literature seemed to have reached its height in respect to productiveness; and sunk again with a still greater rapidity, probably

⁶³ On all which concerns the Russian Bible Society, Henderson's *Biblical Researches* contain most interesting details. The active part however, which he ascribes to the Jesuits, in effecting the suppression of the Society, is far from being historically ascertained.

⁶⁴ See Backmeister's *Russische Bibliothek*, Riga 1772—87.

* See above, Note 61.

in consequence of the political measures of the government. The year 1824 produced only 264 Russian works; in 1831 the number issued was 479. The yearly average of literary productions, original and translated, since 1800, is about 300 to 400 annually; while in the long interval from A. D. 1700 to 1800, only 1000 works were printed. More than 10,000 manuscripts, never yet printed, are scattered through the imperial and monastic libraries. A few of these have very recently been brought to light, which are not without historical value.

In the year 1822, three hundred and fifty living writers were enumerated; most of them belonging to the nobility and only one eighth part to the clergy. The literature of the last ten years has been in a great measure confined to works of fiction; especially novels, and lyrical poetry. The only branches of science, which the Russians have hitherto cultivated with some zeal and success are, their national history, topographical descriptions of foreign (mostly Asiatic) countries, books of travels, and philological investigations. Their labours in this last department are, however, chiefly limited to the Slavic languages. Classical literature, being to them of little practical use, has found favour only with a few initiated. Philosophy, and the different departments of natural science, are deserted.⁶⁵ The former as a science, is even despised, and considered as the exclusive property of German pedants and bookworms. The few books which have been published in the departments of statistics, medicine and law,—not only during the last ten years, but throughout this whole period,—are all of them translations, or have been written by foreigners in the Russian service, among whom are highly celebrated names. The theological productions are confined to synodal orations and a few ascetic writings.

In regard to periodical literature, the number of political journals is of course very small; and that which extols most highly the merits and exploits of the Russians, is always considered as

⁶⁵ There are a few honourable exceptions, e. g. Perevoshtchikof's Introduction to Astronomy, some zoological works by Dvigubsky, etc. The work, *Essais philosophiques sur l'homme, publiés par de Jakob*, Halle 1818, was also, although written in French, the production of a Russian. The late author Poletika, brother to the gentleman of that name who filled several years ago the station of Russian envoy to this country, and who, if we are not misinformed, has written in French on the United States, was distinguished for his amiable and elevated character.

the best, and is most patronised by the government and nation. The literary journals, most of which are of a miscellaneous kind, are more in number and are generally conducted with more critical talent. Those of a purely scientific character are rarely sustained longer than a few years; for instance, the very valuable Bibliographical Journal, edited by P. Kuppen, 1825—26. We are sorry to add that the ephemeral race of *annuals*, those vehicles of superficial taste and knowledge, have already taken a broad possession of the Russian Parnassus. Of another description, however, is the annual published by the Academy of Sciences, under the title of *National Annuary*, which contains valuable statistic notices of Russia, all of them founded on the best authority.

Nicholas Karamzin, from the commencement of whose influence the present period of Russian literature is in general dated, was born A. D. 1765. He was educated in the house of a German professor at Moscow. In spite of the early developement of his literary propensities, he entered the military service, which was then considered as the most honourable in Russia. After two years spent in travelling through Europe, he opened his literary career with the publication of a periodical work called the *Moscow Journal*, which exercised a decidedly favourable influence on Russian literature; although those productions of Karamzin himself which first appeared in this journal, evidently bear the stamp of the author's youth. Both in his prose writings and in his scattered lyrical poems, at this period, there is a certain dulcet sentimentality, behind which we look in vain for energetic or true poetic thoughts. He showed more maturity in his second periodical, called the *European Messenger*; where political and moral subjects occupied his pen. But his principal reputation rests upon his *History of the Russian Empire*. In composing this work, he was greatly favoured by the government; all the archives were opened to him; all documents delivered into his hands; and when it was completed, rewards and gratuities of every description were heaped upon the author with imperial munificence, and continued to his widow and children, after his decease in 1826.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ Of Karamzin's *Istoriya Gosudarstva Rossijskovo*, *History of the Russian Empire*, (extending only to the reign of the house of Romanof, A. D. 1613,) in eleven volumes, a second edition was published in 1818. His other works have been collected in nine volumes, of which

The beauties of Karamzin's style are so entirely *idiomatic*, that no one, who is not perfectly and thoroughly acquainted with the language, is able to appreciate in what the charm of his writings consists. To foreigners of sound critical taste, on the contrary, the productions of his earlier life exhibit an affectation, a pretension to feeling, and an emptiness of original thought, sometimes quite intolerable. And as to the more condensed and exact style of his great historical work, the highest beauties of diction, and the acknowledged diligence and accuracy of the writer's examination of facts, could never reconcile us to that *want of truth*, which, without wresting the fact itself, impresses upon it a false character, by the whole colouring and mode of representation. Over the characteristic barbarism of ancient times, his dexterous hand throws a veil of embellishment, and lends a spirit of chivalry and romantic charm to historical persons and deeds, where all the circumstances of place and time stand in absolute contradiction to it. Not seldom do we seem to be perusing a novel.

By this mode of proceeding he of course flattered the national feelings of his countrymen; and thus gained their approbation and applause, in the same measure that he disgusted all other nations. But even in his own country, a spirit of opposition has recently arisen against him. In the year 1830, Polevoi, editor of a periodical work called the 'Telegraph,' announced a new History of Russia, in twelve volumes; and boldly expressed the opinion, that Karamzin's work was neither to be called practical nor philosophical, and was no longer worthy of the present standing of Russian literature. How far he has succeeded in producing a better, we are ignorant.

In respect to Karamzin's innovations on the language, his influence was counterbalanced long ago. He considered the French or English mode of construction as better adapted to the present state of the Russian language, than that imitation of the classical structure, which had hitherto given to the Russian prose writings so stiff and awkward an air. He himself adopted with ease and gracefulness the peculiarities of these modern languages; but a portion of his followers thought to reach the same

a third edition was published in 1820. This great historical work has been translated twice into German, first by Hauenschild and Oertel, and later by Tappe; and twice into French, St. Pet. 1818, and by St. Thomas and Jauffert, Paris 1820.

object by introducing Gallicisms. Just at the proper time an opposition was formed; the head of which, Admiral Shishkof, insisted upon preserving the influence of the Church Slavonic upon the Russian language; and reproached Karamzin with having injured the purity of the latter by the introduction of foreign forms. These two parties, which still divide the Russian literature in some measure, are called the *Russian* and *Slavonic*, or also the *Moscow* and *Petersburg* parties.

Not much less influence than Karamzin on the Russian prose, has Ivan Dmitrief, b. 1760, exercised on poetry. He has more taste and purity than any of his predecessors; and was the first to prove by a great many poetical tales, fables, odes, etc. that imagination and correctness of language are not incompatible. The most successful of his followers are these: Shukofsky, b. 1784, a poet of true and deep feeling, without affectation, possessing more of what the Germans call *subjectivity*, than any other Russian writer. He took the Germans for his models, and partly imitated and partly translated them with success.⁶⁶ Pushkin, b. 1799, an imitator of Byron, and hence styled the Russian Byron; but according to even his warmest admirers, more to be compared to the British poet in respect to his tendency, than to his genius. His most distinguished production is an historical tragedy, entitled *Boris Godhunof*, published in 1831.⁶⁷ Koslof, interesting by his personal character and misfortunes, and Baron Rosen, both of them likewise imitators of Byron, whose influence on modern Russian poetry is very strong. Further: Prince Vjazemsky, Vostokof, Batjushkof,* Rilejef, Baron Delwig, Glinka, etc. all of them undoubtedly men of uncommon poetic gifts. As writers of fables, a favourite department among the Russians, Krilof and Chernitzer are distinguished; as dramatic poets, Shakhofskoï, Chmelnitzky, and Ozerof. The latter belongs properly to the preceding period; and the success

⁶⁶ The latest edition of Shukofsky's collected works (long since no longer complete) was published, so far as we know, St. Pet. 1824.

⁶⁷ A good review of Pushkin's writings is given in the tenth volume of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*. It was written however before Pushkin's principal work, *Boris Godhunof*, was published, or at least known in England.

* The *Foreign Quarterly Review* contains under the head *Critical Sketches*, a review of Batjushkof's works and a specimen of his poetry. Vol. IX. p. 218.

he met with can hardly be explained except by the want of competitors.

In recent times no form of poetry has found more applause, than the historical novel; without however producing another Walter Scott. The most distinguished names in this department are T. Bulgarin, Sagoskin, Massalsky, Svinjin, etc.

The literature of translation has been enriched, by Gnjeditch's version of the Iliad; Merzljakof's translation of Tasso's Jerusalem; Wojeikof's Eneid; Martynof's translation of several ancient classics, etc.

To foreigners, the travels of the Russians by sea and land offer the most interesting and instructive part of their literature. The most distinguished of their well known expeditions have indeed been conducted by Germans, as Krusenstern, Kotzebue, Bellinghausen, etc. others however by Russians, as Golovnin, Lasaref, etc. and the results of all of them contribute to the honour of Russia and are laid up in the temple of her literature. The regions of Malo-Russia, the Caucasus, and Taurida, of which comparatively little was known, were explored by Muraviev-Apostol, Glinka, Bronefsky, etc. and described by them in valuable volumes. An account of China by Timkofsky, was translated in 1827 into the English language. The works of the monk Hyacinth Bitchourin, head of the Russian ecclesiastical mission at Pekin, published in 1828—32, are of great importance for the knowledge of China, Thibet, and the country of the Mongols.⁶⁶ The great patriot and protector of science, Rom-

⁶⁶ This venerable missionary, who resided at Pekin from 1807 to 1821, has published since he returned to his country a series of valuable and instructive works, a catalogue of which, as they have met with general acknowledgement in foreign countries, will probably be acceptable to the American reader.—1. *Sapiski o Mongolii*, etc. Account of Mongolia, St. Pet. 1828, 2 vols. It contains a part of his travels, a description of the country and people, and a translation of the Mongol code of laws.—2. *Opisanie Tibeta*, etc. i. e. Description of Thibet in its present state, translated from the Chinese, with remarks and illustrations, St. Pet. 1828. This work has been translated into French and published by Klaproth under the title: *Description du Tibet partiellement du Chinois en Russe, par le P. Hyacinth Bitchourin, et du Russe en Français par M. . . etc. Accompagnée de Notes par M. Klaproth*, Paris 1831.—3. Description of Dahongary and Eastern Turkestan, in 2 vols. under the title: *Opisanie Dzhongarii i vostotchnavo Turkestana*, etc. St. Pet. 1829.—4. *Istoriya pervykh tchetirekh Chanov*, etc. i. e. History of the first four Khans of the House of Jenghis, St.

yanzof, whose name is known throughout the civilized world, caused Abulghasi's *Historia Mongolorum et Tartarorum* to be printed in 1825, under the special care of the distinguished German oriental scholar Fraehn. The publication of the Mongol work, *History of the Eastern Mongols and their Princes*, written by Ssanang Ssetzen, with a German translation and illustrations and remarks by J. J. Schmidt, although no Russian work, may be mentioned here, as it was only made possible by Russian means, and the support of the emperor. The same author, known to the literary world by his learned *Researches in Eastern Asia*, translated also the Gospels into the Mongol and Kalmuk languages for the Russian Bible society. A Mongol Grammar was prepared by him in 1828, and a Mongol-German-Russian Dictionary was announced in 1834. A Mongol-Russian Dictionary had been previously published by Igumnof of Irkutsk. Volkof composed a Tartar Dictionary, an earlier one having been written by Giganof in 1804. For the study of the Armenian, numerous opportunities are presented; the Armenian archimandrite Seraphim published in 1819 an Armenian elementary Encyclopedia, and in 1822 a Russian Armenian Dictionary. A new Turkish Dictionary by Rbasis appeared 1830 at St. Petersburg. But the oriental studies of the Russians are not limited to the languages of the Russian empire. A Hebrew Grammar has been published by Pavsky, the learned author of the Russian version of the Old Testament; and in the year 1821 there were, according to Henderson, not less than forty of his pupils employed as teachers in the different academies and seminaries throughout the country. An Arabic Grammar has been published by Boldryef, and also a Persian Chrestomathy in 1826. Senkofsky translated the *Derbent-Nahmeh*; and also edited with considerable additions the French-Arabic dictionary, originally written by the Swede Berggren, a work of the highest utility to the Arabic scholar, not a mere vocabulary, but full of geographical notices and general information; in short a work which, according to the prospectus written by the learned Fraehn, "contains every thing that can be useful to the traveller, diplomatic agent, missionary, physician or merchant." The editor among other things has added in Roman characters the vulgar

Pet. 1829. This and the preceding work are not properly translations, but original works, drawn from Chinese sources, all of which are specified. Besides these works, Hyacinth has published some of less importance, translations from the Chinese, etc.

pronunciation of the Arabic, which differs materially from that given by the grammarians.

Among the ecclesiastical writers of this period, Ambrosius Protasof, archbishop of Kazan and Simbirsk, and Philaret Drozdof, archbishop of Moscow, are considered as the most eloquent. The last is the author of several works on church history. Other theological writers of merit are the following: Eugene Bolchovitinof,⁶⁰ metropolitan of Kief, Ambrosius Podobjedof, metropolitan of Novogorod, and Michael Desnitzky, metropolitan of St. Petersburg. Stanislas Bogush, a Roman Catholic priest, published a history of Taurida and several other historical works in the Russian language. Several successful attempts have recently been made, by clergymen and by laymen, to describe portions of the history of their own country. Such are Krilof, (not the poet,) S. Glinka, and others: The branch of *Memoires* also, in the French sense of the word, has recently been much cultivated. The publications of Count Munnich, in 1818; of Prince Shakhofsky, 1821; of General Danilevsky, 1830; and of Admiral Shishkof, 1832; are valuable contributions to the history of our time.

The national feeling of the Russians has led them, during the period of their literary history, to examine the nature of their language; and all philosophical investigations, or antiquarian researches, which could throw additional light upon the past, have been favoured by persons of distinction and influence; as for example, by Admiral Shishkof, himself a writer on various subjects. With this view he caused a new edition of the Dictionary of the Russian Academy to be published, and the preparation of another more perfect work of that kind, founded on an improved plan.* To this class of philological antiquarians belong the names of Vostokof already cited in these pages, Sokolof, Kalaïdovitch, and Stroyef, the two latter learned and judicious commentators on old manuscripts which they first published, and which but for them would still lie mouldering in dust

⁶⁰ The reputation of this clergyman rests however more on his publications in the department of bibliography and literary history, than on his own theological works.

* The etymological tables, published since 1819 by Shishkof, as a specimen of the labours of the Academy, are highly interesting. We see here the words reduced to the first elements of the language; and in some cases more than 2000 words springing from a single root.

and oblivion. In the department of literary history and bibliography, we find as writers of merit, P. Koeppen, author of the well-written article "Kunst und Altherthum in Russland" in the Vienna *Jahrbücher*, and of various valuable paleographic and other essays in the Russian language; also Gretsck, Sopikof, Anastasevitch, the metropolitan Eugene above mentioned, Pleuef, Mussin-Pushkin, Korshavin, Katchenofsky, etc. etc.

This is not the place to enlarge on the distinguished merits which foreigners, and especially Germans, have acquired in relation to Russian history, statistics, etc. But their labours in relation to the language, form a part of the literature to which they were devoted; and cannot of course be separated from the works of native writers. The most distinguished names in this department are again Germans, viz. Heym, Vater, Tappe, Puchmayer, etc. The catalogue of elementary works upon the Russian language, is too long to be inserted here; we limit ourselves therefore to those only which are written in English, and the best in German and French. The English grammars and dictionaries of the Russian, are indeed so few, that an American or Englishman would never succeed in acquiring a full knowledge of the language, except through the medium of the German and French. The first Russian Grammar, however, that was ever printed, was published at Oxford. We give the titles of this and of the other principal grammars and lexicons of the Russian language, in the note below.⁷⁰ Schaffarik's often

⁷⁰ This was Ludolf's *Grammatica Russica et manuductio ad linguam Slavonicam*, Oxon. 1696.—ENGLISH Russian Grammars are, *Novaya ross. Gram. dlja Anglitshani*, 'Russian Grammar for Englishmen,' St. Petersburg, 1822. Heard's *Practical Grammar of the Russian Language*, St. Pet. 1827. 2 vols. 8vo.—GERMAN Russian Grammars are: Heym's *Russ. Sprachlehre für Deutsche*, Riga, 1789, 1794, 1804. Vater's *Prakt. Gramm. der russ. Sprache*, Leipz. 1808, 1814. Tappe's *Neue russ. Sprachlehre für Deutsche*, St. Pet. 1810, 1814, 1820. Schmidt's *Prakt. russ. Grammatik*, Leip. 1813. Puchmayer's *Lehrgebäude der russ. Sprache*, Prag 1820.—FRENCH Russian Grammars are: Maudru's *Elémens raisonnés de la Langue Russe*, Paris, 1802. Langen's *Manuel de la Langue Russe*, St. Pet. 1825. Charpentier's *Elémens de la Langue Russe*, St. Pet. 1768 to 1805, five editions. In the course of the year 1828 a French translation of the Russian Grammar of Gretsck was prepared in two parts under the titles: *Grammaire Russe raisonnée* and *Grammaire Russe pratique*.

DICTIONARIES.—Parenoga's *Lex. Anglinsko-ross.* and *Russian-English Lexicon*, 4 vols. 1808-17. Zdanof's *Angl-ross. Lex.* and *Russian*

cited History of the Slavic Language and Literature may be consulted with advantage by any one who desires more complete information on the grammatical and lexical literature of the Russians.*

III. History of the Servian Language and Literature.

The literature of the occidental Slavo-Servians⁷¹ has hitherto been altogether separated from that of their brethren of the ori-

Engl. Dict. St. Pet. 1784. Shishkof's *Lex. angl. franc. ross.* St. Pet. 1795. Heym's *Russ. deutsch und Deutsch-russ. Wörterb.* Riga 1795-98. The same writer's *Russisch, Deutsch, und Französ. Wörterb.* in several forms and editions, Riga 1796 to 1812. Schmidt's *Nov. Karm. Slovar*, Leipz. 1815. Tatishtchef's *Franc. russ. Lex.* St. Pet. 1816. Oldekop's *Russ. Deutsch. Wörterb.* St. Pet. 1825.

* The Foreign Quarterly Review, Vol. I, contains a valuable article on Russian literature, evidently written, or at least prepared, not by an Englishman, but by a Russian. Bowrings' Russian Anthology is the only work known to us, adapted to make the mere English reader somewhat acquainted with the Russian poetic literature. To those to whom not the Slavic, but the German and French languages are accessible, we recommend the following: *Anthologie Russe*, par Dupré de St. Maure, Paris 1823. Gretsch's *Handbuch der russ. Literatur*, St. Pet. 1821. Oldekop's *St. Petersburger Zeitschrift. Von der Borg's Poetische Erzeugnisse der Russen*, Riga 1823. Von Knorring's *Russ. Bibliothek für Deutsche*, Revel 1831. Von Goetze's *Stimmen des russischen Volks*, Stuttg. 1828. Specimens of Karamzin's writings are contained in Richter's *Russische Miscellen*, Mosc. 1801-1809.

⁷¹ This portion of the Slavic race has hitherto been more generally known under the general appellation of *Illyrians*. With the exception of the Bulgarians, who never have been comprehended under it, this name has alternately been applied to all the Southern Slavic nations; sometimes only to the Dalmatians and Slavonians; sometimes to them together with the Croatians and Vindes; by others again to the Turkish Servians and Bosnians, etc. The old Illyrians, i. e. the inhabitants of the Roman province Illyricum, were not Slavi; but a people related to the old Thracians, the forefathers of the present Albanians. See Schaffarik, p. 23, n. 2. *Illyricum Magnum* comprised in the fourth century nearly all the Roman provinces of eastern Europe. Napoleon affected to renew the names and titles of the ancient Roman empire, and called the territory ceded to him by Austria in 1809, viz. Carniola, and all the country between the Adriatic, the Save, and the Turkish empire, his Illyrian provinces, and their inhabitants Illyrians. In the year 1815 a new kingdom of Illyria was founded as an Austrian province, comprehending Carniola, Carin-

ental church, and treated as a distinct branch. Their language, however, being essentially the same, we do not see why the rather accidental circumstance, that the former use the Roman letters, while the latter adhere to the Cyrillic alphabet, should be a sufficient reason for such a separation. The literature of neither of them has as yet treasures enough, to renounce willingly the claims which their mutual and naturally rich though uncultivated language gives to the one upon the productions of the other. We now proceed, in a short historical introduction, to show the origin of this separation; after making a few preliminary remarks on the character of the language as a whole, unaffected by its division into different dialects, not more distinct indeed from each other than is the case in almost every other living idiom.

The Servian language is spoken by about five millions of people. It extends, with some slight variations of dialect, over the Turkish and Austrian provinces of Servia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Dalmatia; over Slavonia and the eastern part of Croatia. It is further the property of several thousands, who emigrated from their own country on account of the Turkish oppression, and are now settled as colonists along the south-western bank of the Danube, from Semlin to St. André near Buda. A dialect of it, with greater variations, is spoken by the Bulgarians. The southern sky, and the beauties of natural scenery existing throughout nearly all these regions, so favourable in general to the developement of poetical genius, appear also to have exerted a happy influence on the language. While it yields to none of the other Slavic dialects in richness, clearness, and precision, it far surpasses all of them in euphony. The Servian has often been called the *Italian* among the other Slavic idioms. Comparisons of this sort are always superficial, and tend to give a false view of the character of an object. Be this as it may, the

this, and Trieste with its territory. It is partly on account of this indefiniteness, that the name of *Illyrians* has been entirely relinquished by modern philologists. In its stead the name of *Servians*, or more properly *Serbians*, *Serbs*, has been adopted as a general appellation by the best authorities. See below, § 1, on the Literature of the Servians of the Greek Church. The word *Srb*, *Serb*, *Sorab*, has been alternately derived from *Srp*, scythe; from *Siberi*, Sever, north; from *Sarmat*; from *Serbulja*, a kind of shoe or sock; from *servus*, servant, etc. The true derivation has not yet been found out. See Dobrovsky's History of the Bohemian Language, etc. 1818, and also his *Inst. Ling. Slav.* 1822.

Servian is decidedly the most melodious of the Slavic languages, rich in vowels, and abounding alike in soft and powerful accents. The accumulation of consonants, with which the other dialects are so often reproached, is rarely, if ever, to be met with in Servian. The reader may compare the Servian *wetar* with *wjtr*, *krilo* with *křjldo* or *skrzydło*, *pao* with *padl*, etc. Those who ascribe this mildness of the Servian language to the Italian neighbourhood of Dalmatia, forget that the eastern Servians possess the same advantage. It is true that the dialects of these latter are at the same time full of Turcisms; but these are mere excrescences, which may easily be removed without touching the essential structure of the language. The Turkish words adopted into the Servian, are mostly nouns, and verbs derived from them; and may naturally be explained by their political relation to the Turks during so many centuries. If we may confide in a remark of the profound philologist J. Grimm, *some* foreign ingredients are useful and even necessary to languages. They act as a cement, and fill up gaps; nay, they not seldom serve to give to the expression colouring and pliancy. The attention of the civilized world, although directed at the beginning of the present century to the Servians and their heroic struggles, has only recently been excited in respect to their language; and this through the efforts of a single individual. We shall have more to say on this point in the section devoted to the literature of the Servians of the eastern church.

The ancient Illyricum comprised all the countries situated between the Adriatic and the Black Sea, and along the Danube and Save.⁷² Towards the middle of the seventh century, we find this vast country mostly occupied by a Slavic people of one and the same race, alternately called Bulgarians, Croatians, and Servians. We find also six kingdoms gradually established by them: Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia (Rama), Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia; some of them powerful and of great influence in their time, but now and long since sunk into ruin, and existing only as Turkish or Austrian provinces. An impenetrable night rests on the early history of these regions; and if the judicious criticism of modern philologists has thrown comparatively some light on this general topic, still, their investigations have been of little consequence for the history of the language. All that it concerns us to note here, is, that as early as the seventh century, a part of these nations were already Christians, converted

⁷² See above, p. 334 sq. and the preceding note.

by Romish priests. Among the remainder, Christianity as taught by Greek missionaries found a welcome reception in the eighth and ninth centuries, and was soon fully established. The oriental Servians had the chief seat of their power in the present Turkish province of Serf-Vilayeti; and governed by princes called *Shupans*, we see them in a constant war of resistance against the Greek emperors, and during several centuries also against the powerful Khans of Bulgaria; now conquered, subjugated, destroyed almost to annihilation, but recovering with effort and rising again in power, with such energy as to enable them under the great Tzar, Stephan Dushan, not only to hold all their neighbours in awe, but to take a menacing position towards Byzantium itself, and dictate conditions of peace to the imploring envoys of that proud imperial court. - But this brilliant point of Servian glory, which even now after five hundred years still lives in the hearts of the people, and is the subject of a thousand legends and songs, was only a meteor. It vanished in almost the same moment that it appeared. Stephan's immediate successors, enfeebled by their domestic dissensions, sunk under the superior forces of the Turks, who had broken into Europe thirty-four years earlier. They soon became the conquerors of the Servians, though not without fierce and bloody struggles; and they still remain their masters and oppressors.⁷³

The occidental Servians were early divided into small states, some of which adopted an aristocratic republican form of constitution. Among these, only the republic of Ragusa requires to be mentioned here, as the cradle of the Dalmatian branch of Servian literature. The local situation of these occidental states, made them dependent on Hungary; and thus Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, sometimes under the title of kingdoms, and now dukedoms, became at length mere provinces of that larger kingdom, and ultimately of the Austrian empire. Bosnia and Herzegovina, which form the boundary between the Servians of the East and West, were subject to the influence of both; and are to the present day divided in religion and in language.

⁷³ The Servians, under the government of their own distinguished countryman, prince Milosh, have, however, for some years enjoyed a certain degree of freedom, which will no doubt have good results for the mental life of the nation. A very good view of their country, constitution, and literature, is given in a recent German work: *Reise nach Serbien im Spätherbst* 1829, by Otto von Birch, Berlin 1830.

§ 1. *Literature of the Servians of the Oriental or Greek Church.*

However small the circuit of country, properly called Servia, is in proportion to the whole extent over which the southern Slavi are spread, the name of Servians nevertheless appears to modern philologists as the best adapted for being employed as the common name of them all. Dobrovsky thinks it even appropriate to become the general appellation for all Slavic nations. Although of obscure derivation, it is at least sufficiently ascertained that it is of pure Slavic origin; glorious associations are attached to it; it is moreover still a living name, while the learned appellation of *Illyrians*, formerly more in use, is dead; and that of *Bosnians*, preferred by some Dalmatian writers, rests upon no satisfactory grounds. The name of Servians, however, was never, till recently, applied to the Dalmatians.

(a) Servians, Bosnians, Greek Slavonians, etc.

The literature of the eastern Servians, the result of their intellectual life as a nation, is not yet twenty years old. Up to that time, all the Servians belonging to the Greek church, notwithstanding the honourable example of Russia to the contrary, had written in the Old or Church Slavonic; or, in more modern times, in a language mixed up from this latter and several other dialects. Schaffarik remarks, that out of about 400 Servian books printed between the years 1742, or more properly 1761, and 1826, about one eighth part are written in Old Slavic; another eighth in the common dialect of the people; while all the rest vary between these two in innumerable shades and degrees.⁷⁴ This eighth part written in ordinary Servian, are all of very recent date. Indeed, with the exception of a single writer, Obradovitch, who found no immediate followers, the dialect of the people was in general despised by the clergy and those who laid claim to education, as being wholly unfit for books, and (as Vuk Stephanoitch strongly expresses himself) only proper for "cowherds and swineherds." How the once flourishing literature of Ragusa could ever have sunk into oblivion to such a degree, is hardly to be conceived; as indeed in general, the division so sharply drawn in respect to literature between those two branches of the same people, while they were still bound together by the strong ties of one and the same language of common life and in part also of the same government, belongs among the most remarkable facts in literary history.

⁷⁴ See Schaffarik, p. 217.

The most ancient document of the Servian Old Slavic language, is out of the middle of the thirteenth century, viz. the *Hexaemeron* of Basilus, with a preface by John, exarch of Bulgaria. Then follow the 'Acts of the Apostles,' written by the hieromonach Damian, A. D. 1324. Of higher historical importance are some secular writings from the end of the thirteenth to the middle of the fourteenth century, viz. a genealogical register of the Servian princes and the events of their reigns, called *Radoslov*, written by archbishop Daniel; a similar work called the *Tzarostavnick*; and above all the statutes of Tzar Dushan the Powerful, A. D. 1336—56. These statutes, dated from the year 6837, or A. D. 1349, not only afford us a good survey of the constitution of the Servian kingdom, but are a remarkable contribution to the history of its moral state at that early period. The philanthropist cannot but perceive with satisfaction, the rare union that reigns in these laws of stern justice and true christian benevolence, attempting to alleviate those evils which it was not in the power of an individual to abolish,—the hardships of slavery, the insecurity of property peculiar to those barbarous times, and those rash and bloody acts of self-protection, which are preferred by the powerful all over the world to the slower steps of avenging justice. It is indeed remarkable to observe, how these statutes not only counteracted the grosser vices and crimes, (which for the most part is the only object of laws,) but also favoured the characteristic virtues of the times, for instance hospitality. One statute ordains, that when a traveller asked for night-quarters at the dwelling of a land-proprietor and was not admitted, he had the right to take lodgings in his village wherever he pleased; and did he lose any thing, not his host, but the proprietor who had refused to harbour him, was bound to remunerate the loss.⁷⁵

The monks of this and the following centuries must have written a great deal; as is proved by the many manuscripts that still lie accumulated in the numerous Servian and Macedonian monasteries,—the mere remnant of those which perished in the long tempests of bloody wars and desolating conflagrations. About fifty years after the invention of printing, some of the church books from time to time were published in Servia and Syrmia. The earliest Servian print extant is from the year 1493, viz. an *Octateuch*, published at Zenta in Herzegovina. In

⁷⁵ These statutes were first printed by Raitch, in his great work on Slavic history (see Note 78); and translated by Engel in his *History of Hungary and the adjacent Territories*, Vol. 2, p. 283.

Russia they did not begin to print until sixty years later. In 1552 the Gospels were printed in Belgrade; in 1562 another edition in Negromont. But after these faint signs of life became extinct, we hear no longer of the least trace of literature among the Servians of the Turkish empire; and among the Austrian Servians also, literature seems to have been equally dead, with the exception of a History of Servia, written and left in manuscript by George Brankovitch, the last despot of that country, towards the close of the seventeenth century. A genealogical work published by Dshesarovitch at Vienna in 1742, had to be engraved, for the want of proper types. In the year 1755, under the reign of Maria Theresa, when some attention began to be paid to the schools of her Illyrian provinces, the archbishop of Carlovitz was compelled to have Smotrisky's Grammar⁷⁶ printed in Walachia, because no Slavic types were to be found in the whole Austrian empire. Some years afterwards, A. D. 1758, a private Slavic press was founded at Venice. In Austria, Cyrillic-Slavonic books could not be printed earlier than A. D. 1771, when a printing office was established at Vienna; the monopoly of which for all Slavo-Servian scientific works throughout the empire, was given to the university of Buda. From this one point, therefore, the whole literary cultivation of the Servians of the oriental church in the Austrian empire, can alone proceed.⁷⁷

After the partial revival of Servian literature in 1758, a considerable number of works were composed; and there are among them not a few, which, notwithstanding the mixed and unsettled idiom in which they are written, attest the general capacity of the nation, and may serve as imperfect specimens of the mass of talent buried there. Among the historical writers, we must name above all J. Raitch. He wrote on many different subjects; and also left behind him a whole library of theological manuscripts. His 'History of the Slavic Nations'⁷⁸ has given him a lasting reputation. Other historical writers of

⁷⁶ See above, in the History of the Old Slavic Language, p. 357.

⁷⁷ There is however still another Cyrillic printing office attached to an Armenian convent in Vienna. Since the printing of Vuk's second edition of the Servian popular songs at Leipsic, several other Servian books have also been printed there.

⁷⁸ The complete title of this valuable work is: *Istorja raznich Slavenskich narodov nairatchvedshe Chorvatov, Bolgarov i Srbov*, Vienna 1792—95, 4 vols.

some merit, are, Kengelatz, Magarashevitch, Julinat, Solaritch, etc.⁷⁹ Writers on different subjects of natural philosophy and medicine, are, Orphelin, Stoïkovitch, Beritch, Jankovitch, P. Hadshitch, etc. On statistics, geography, etc. the above mentioned Solaritch, Vuitch, Bulitch, Popovitch, and others. In the department of theology, we hardly meet with a single book of a doctrinal character; but there are quite a number on ethics. The principal writers of the language, therefore, may perhaps be more properly arranged under the heads of philosophy (comprehending logic), rhetoric, ethics, etc. as Obradovitch, Raitch, Lazarevitch, Vuitch, Davidovitch, Masovitch, etc.⁸⁰

Poetry and belles lettres being more dependent on the state of the language than purely scientific works, we cannot proceed any further, without first making our readers acquainted with the recent innovations of a few distinguished and patriotic individuals.

It was Dositheï Obradovitch, born A. D. 1739 in the Banat of Temeswar, who first among the oriental Servians ventured to write books in the despised language of the country. The fortunes of this person are, in several respects, of uncommon interest. After twenty-five years of travelling all over Europe, he returned to his comparatively barbarous native land, where he died in 1811, as inspector of the schools, and the instructor of the children of the celebrated Kara George. He left several works. A far greater influence, however, has been exerted on Servian literature by Davidovitch and Vuk Stephanovitch Karadshitch, who have not only followed the same course, but were the first to defend both theoretically and practically the principle, that the Servians ought to *write* as they *speak*. Their boldness met with strong and decided opposition from the old school; and the contest and rivalry which have been the consequence, although tending for the present to prevent the progress of the good cause, cannot but have, ere long, beneficial results, by exciting the minds of the people to a higher activity than they have had until now occasion to exert.

⁷⁹ The writings of this very productive philologist and historian are however more remarkable for boldness and singularity of assertion, than for depth. In his *Rimljani slavenstvovavshii*, Buda 1818, he undertakes to derive the entire Latin language from the Slavic. In an earlier work, written 1809, he contends that the German language was a corruption of the Slavic dialects spoken on the Elbe, etc.

⁸⁰ The reader will find a more complete catalogue of the Servian writers and their works, in O. v. Birch's Travels; see above, Note 73.

Davidovitch published from 1814 to 1822 a Servian newspaper in Vienna, not exclusively of a political character, by which he intended to diffuse information on various subjects; the first undertaking of the kind in his language. His influence however is not confined to the language alone; as secretary of prince Milosh, the present head of the Servians, his influence on the general cultivation of his countrymen is very decided. Vuk Stephanovitch, born 1786 in Turkish Servia, is the author of the first Oriental-Servian grammar and dictionary; and in the arrangement of the former has manifested the true spirit of a genuine grammarian. Besides these he has written several works of value, a biography of prince Milosh, a series of annuals, etc. But the best proof which he could give of the beauty, richness, and perfectibility of the vulgar Servian dialect, is his Collection of the Servian popular Songs, in three volumes, comprising nevertheless only about the fourth or fifth part of the similar treasures hidden among the mountains of his country. In making this collection, he very judiciously wrote down only those songs which he had himself caught from the lips of the Servian peasantry. There had already been a rumor among the literati of Europe for more than fifty years, of the beauty and singularity of the Illyrian national songs, founded mostly on the communications of Italian travellers and the citations of Dalmatian dictionaries. But when Vuk's collection appeared, and a part of its contents was made intelligible to the civilized world by translations, imperfect and deficient as any translation of popular poetry must necessarily ever be, the public and the critics were nevertheless alike struck with the strong expression of the high and incomparable beauties of nature. All that the other Slavic nations, or the Germans, the Scotch, and the Spaniards, possess of popular poetry, can at the utmost be compared with the lyrical part of the Servian songs, called by them *female* songs, because they are sung only by females and youths; but the long epic compositions, by which a peasant bard, sitting in a large circle of other peasants, in unpremeditated but perfectly regular and harmonious verse, celebrates the heroic deeds of their ancestors or cotemporaries, has no parallel in the whole history of literature since the days of Homer.⁸¹

⁸¹ The title of Vuk's collection, a part of which appeared 1814—15 at Vienna, in two small volumes, is *Narodne Srpske pjesme*, Lpzg. 1823—24. Some of these remarkable songs have been made known to the English public in Bowring's Servian Popular Poetry, London 1827. This little collection contains also an able and spirited

The same individual published at Vienna, in 1824, the Gospel of St. Luke, as a 'Specimen of a translation of the New Testament into Servian.' How much part he had in the version printed at Leipsic by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and now circulated among the Servians, we are unable to say.*

introduction, which serves to give a clear view not only of the state of the Servians in particular, but also of the relation of the Slavic nations to each other in general; with the exception of some mistakes in respect to classification.—In Germany a general interest for Servian national poetry was excited by Goethe. See his *Kunst und Alterthum*, Vol. V. Nos. I and II. German translations are: *Volkslieder der Serben*, by Talvj, 2 vols. Halle 1825—26. *Die Wila*, by Gerhardt, 2 vols. Lpzg. 1828. These two works contain nearly all the songs published by Vuk, but only half of those he has collected. *Serbische Volkslieder*, by v. Goetze, St. Pet. and Lpz. 1827. *Serbische Hochzeitslieder*, by Eugen Wesely, 1826. A French translation of these songs does not yet exist, although they have excited a deep interest among the literati of France. The work *la Guzla*, published at Paris in 1827 and purporting to contain translations of Dalmatian national songs, is not genuine, but was written by the French poet Mérimée, with much talent indeed, but without any knowledge of the Servian language.

* We must correct here a mistake made by Dr Henderson in his *Biblical Researches*, in respect to the Servian New Testament. He says, p. 263, "A version of the (Servian) New Testament was indeed executed some years ago, but its merits were not of such a description as to warrant the committee of the Russian Bible Society to carry it through the press; yet, as they were deeply convinced of the importance of the object, they were induced to engage a native Servian, of the name of Athanasius Stoikovitch to make a new translation, the printing of which was completed in the year 1825, but owing to the cessation of the Society's operations, the distribution of the copies has hitherto been retarded." Dr Henderson probably received his information at St. Petersburg, and felt himself of course entitled to depend on it, being very likely not acquainted with the great schism in modern Servian literature above mentioned. If we may confide in our own recollections, the translation, the merits of which the committee of the Russian Bible Society was so little disposed to acknowledge, was made by Vuk Stephanovitch, who knew better than any one else the wants of the Servian people, and who presented in the above mentioned Gospel of St. Luke a specimen to the learned world, which received the approbation of all those Slavic scholars entitled to judge of the subject. The committee of St. Petersburg however was probably composed of gentlemen of the opposite party; as indeed the Russian Servians are, in general, advocates of the mixed Slavo-Servian language, in which for about fifty years all books for the Servians

Modern *educated* Servian poets, upon whose writings the reception which the popular poetry has met with, and no doubt also their own consciousness of its power, have had a favourable influence, are the following: Lucian Mushitzky, a writer of odes and other lyrical pieces, all of them highly esteemed by his countrymen; Simo Milutinovitch, author of an epic poem entitled *Servianca*, which describes the Servian war of 1812, and a writer of lyric poetry, of a tragedy, etc. J. Popovitch, Milovan Vidakovitch, M. Vitkovitch, G. Kovatzevitch, etc.*

Vuk's Grammar, printed at Vienna in 1818, before his Dictionary, has been rendered accessible to other European nations by the celebrated Grimm's translation of it, Leips. and Berl. 1824. Another Servian Grammar has recently been published in German, by Schaffarik.

were written, and which we have described above in Schaffarik's words; see p. 393. According to their ideas of the Servian language, the mere use of the common dialect of the people was sufficient to inspire doubts of the competency of the translator; although it was for the people, the unlearned, that the translation was professedly made. They engaged in consequence Professor Stoikovitch, the author of several Russian and Slavo-Servian books (see above p. 396), and who had been for more than twenty years in the Russian service, to make a new translation. This person, who, to judge from our personal acquaintance with him, probably on this occasion read the Gospels for the first time in his life with any attention, took the rejected version for his basis, altered it, according to his views of the dignity of the Servian language, into the customary mixed Slavo-Servian-Russian idiom, and received the reward from the Society. Whether this is the version afterwards printed at Leipsic and distributed in Servia by the English Bible Society, we are not informed. From private letters we know, that in the year 1827, that Society proposed to Vuk Stephanevitch to allow him £500, if after obtaining appropriate testimonies for the correctness of his version, he would print one thousand copies in Servia; and also authorized its correspondent in Constantinople, Mr Leeves, to arrange the matter finally with Vuk. From M. Kopitar's remark however, that the translation ~~for the~~ Dalmatian Roman Catholics needed only to be transcribed with Cyrillic letters to come into use among the Oriental Servians, we are entitled to conclude that the version now circulated, is not as it ought to be; and a correct one, for that part of the nation, is still a desideratum. It would seem therefore that Vuk Stephanevitch cannot have accepted the offer in question. See Kopitar's Letter to the Editor, *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. III. p. 186.

* See Note 80.

(b) *Bulgarians.*

According to Kopitar, the eminent Slavic philologist, the Bulgarian dialect, spoken in Bulgaria and Macedonia by about half a million of the population, has of all the Slavic dialects been most affected by the course of time, both in its grammatical structure and in its whole character. It has an article, which is put after the words it qualifies, like that of the Albanians and Walachians. Of the seven Slavic cases, only the nominative and vocative remain to it; all the others being supplied through prepositions. As the Bulgarians are a mixture of Slavi, Rumeni, and Tartars, this state of their language can easily be accounted for.⁸² The only point of view from which it can, uncultivated as it is, excite a general interest, is in respect to their popular songs, in which this dialect likewise is exceedingly rich.

The Bulgarians were converted to Christianity by Cyril and Methodius. Their history is a series of continued warfare with the Servians, Greeks, and Hungarians, and finally with the Turks, who subdued them, and in A. D. 1392 put an end to the existence of a Bulgarian kingdom. The people had hitherto adhered to the Greek church; except for a short interval in the last half of the twelfth century, when the Roman chair succeeded in bringing them under its dominion. Since the establishment of the Turkish government, apostasy to Mohammedanism has been, of all the christian provinces of the Porte, most frequent in Bulgaria. Still, the bulk of the population has remained faithful to the Slavic Greek worship. The scanty germs of cultivation sown among them by two or three of their princes, who caused several Byzantine works to be translated into the Bulgarian dialect, perished during the Turkish invasion. The few books used by the priesthood in our days, are obtained from Russia. The Russian Bible Society had prepared a Bulgarian translation of the New Testament, intended more especially for the benefit of about 30,000 Bulgarian colonists in the Russian province of Bessarabia. But the specimen printed in 1823, excited so much doubt as to the competency of the translator in respect to his knowledge of the Bulgarian language, that it was deemed advisable to put a stop to its further progress. Among the Albanian portion of the inhabitants, the New Testament has been distributed by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

⁸² *Wiener Jahrbücher der Literatur*, Vol. XVII.

§ 2. *Literature of the Dalmatians, or Servians of the Roman Catholic Church.*

(a) *Glagolitic Literature.*

As Christianity was first introduced into Dalmatia by Romish priests, the Latin language was of course adopted for religious worship. But when the people became acquainted with the liturgy of Methodius in a language intelligible to them, this innovation met with such a general and heartfelt welcome, that all the severe decrees of synods, nay, of the holy chair of Rome itself, were unable to stop its progress. We have seen above, in our sketch of the history of the Old Slavic language, by what means a shrewd priesthood succeeded in reconciling the minds of the people to the arrogant pretensions of Rome. To avoid repetition, we refer the reader to that part of our article, for the origin of the Glagolitic literature.* A few words will suffice to give a narrative of its further progress.

Glagol signifies in Old Slavic *the word*, or rather *verb*; but the reason of the application of this term to the Servians of the catholic communion, *Glagolitae*, and to the language of their ecclesiastical writings, *Glagolic* or *Glagolitic*, has not yet been ascertained; all that has as yet been asserted by distinguished Slavic philologists being mere hypothesis. The oldest monument known at the present time, in which these letters are extant, is a Psalter of A. D. 1220, which in later years has been ascribed to Jerome himself. The tradition among the Dalmatians was, that this father, a native of Illyria, had translated the whole Bible into Slavic; the sounder criticism of later times has however proved clearly, that he indeed corrected the old Latin version of the Bible, but never wrote a single line of Slavic. Other advocates of this distorted alphabet, have taken great pains to vindicate for it a still earlier birth; but with an equally unsatisfactory result.⁶³

Although the use of the Glagolitic letters was in a certain measure authorized by the pope, the clergy of Dalmatia preferred unanimously the Latin language for their theological or ecclesiastical writings. The Glagolitic literature was therefore almost exclusively limited to copies of the productions of the Cyrillic brethren. The Glagolitic letters had however the advantage of

* See p. 353 above.

⁶³ See Note 32, *ibid.*

the Cyrillic alphabet, in respect to printing. The first printed Glagolitic missal, is of the year 1483; whilst the earliest work printed with Cyrillic letters, is not older than A. D. 1491.⁶⁴ In the sixteenth century, books were printed at Zengh (Segna), at Fiume, at Venice, and at Tübingen, with Glagolitic letters. In the year 1621, the emperor Ferdinand II presented the Propaganda with a fount of Glagolitic types, which he obtained from Venice. Several improved breviaries and missals have since been printed at Rome. In our day, this city possesses the only Glagolitic printing office in existence. On the Dalmatian islands, books are still copied in manuscript, just as before the invention of printing.

Among the Dalmatian clergy, there were a few who united a real interest for the preservation of their language and for science in general. Raph. Levakovitch improved the breviary in 1648, in respect to language; the archbishop Vincenz Zamajevich, d. 1771, a great patron of the literature of his country, founded a hundred years later a theological seminary in Zara. Mathias Caraman, on occasion of a new edition of the missal by the Propaganda in 1741, undertook a fundamental revision and correction of it. The Propaganda also founded a Slavic professorship in the *Collegio Urbano*; and for the benefit of this Society a new translation of the whole Bible was resolved upon, which however has never been published. A notice of the exertions of the priest Rosa belongs rather to the history of Dalmatian secular literature.

(5) Secular Literature of the Dalmatians or Catholic Servians.

It is not certain at what time, nor by whom, the Latin letters were first adopted for the Servian language. The earliest teachers of the occidental portion of that people having been Romish priests, they of course used their own letters for writing such Slavic words or names as occasion required. The Latin alphabet probably came into use without any particular pains, long before the introduction of the Glagolitic letters. These, in their awkward hieroglyphic form, were little adapted to supersede the Latin forms. The example of the Poles and Bohemians could only encourage the first Dalmatian writers to continue in the same course; although each of these nations follows a different system of pronouncing the same letters. The orthography of the Dalmatians remained, however, for a long time en-

⁶⁴ See above, p. 356.

tirely unsettled ; and is so still in some measure. A greater difficulty arose from the absurd practice of the Slavonians and Croatians, who, although speaking and writing the same language, yet write and print it each according to a different system of combination ; thus limiting the perusal of their own scanty productions almost exclusively to the few readers of their small provinces respectively, whilst the remainder of their countrymen are hardly able to understand them. This division, however, compels us likewise to separate in our sketch the literature of the Dalmatians proper, and that of the Catholic Slavonians.

Literature of Dalmatia proper.

The neighbourhood of the Italians exercised in very early times a happy influence on the literature of the Dalmatians. The small republic of Ragusa was, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, at the zenith of its splendour and welfare. Celebrated Italians were teachers in her schools ; and the persecuted Greeks, Lascaris, Demetrius Chalcondylas, Emanuel Marulus, and several others, celebrated over all Europe for their learning, found an asylum within her walls. Thus the treasures of the classics and of the Italian middle ages became familiar to the noble youths of Ragusa, until in the beginning of the sixteenth century poetry began to appear in a national dress. Blasius Darvitch, Sigismund Menze, Mauro Vetravitch, and Stephen Gozze, (d. 1576), are mentioned as the first Dalmatian poets. The latter wrote a comic epic, the *Dervishiade*, which met with great success. A poem of the same kind is *Jegyupka*, the Gipsy, by Andreas Giubranovitch, printed at Venice 1559. Dominic Zlataritch, d. 1608, translated Tasso and the Electra of Sophocles ; and was himself a lyric poet. The annals of this period report also, about A. D. 1600, the name of a lady, Floria Zuzzeri, married to Pescioni, a rare appearance in Slavic literature.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Ragusa enjoyed peace and a degree of wealth and prosperity most favourable to high attainments in science and literature. The first Slavic theatre was founded here. John Gondola, d. 1638, the translator of Tasso's Jerusalem and author of several poems still extant, furnished it with dramatic pieces, which have all perished in the vicissitudes of time. Junius Palmota, d. 1657, wrote likewise for the stage, selecting his subjects especially from Slavic history.

In the year 1667, a horrible earthquake in a few moments

destroyed the prosperity of the state for whole centuries. It was as if the genius of the Ragusian literature had been crushed under the ruins. From that period we find the literature in a rapid decline. The catastrophe itself, however, furnished the poets with a new subject. In the same year, N. Bonus published a poem entitled, 'The city of Ragusa to her Rulers;' and Jacob Palmota, d. 1680, wrote an elegiac poem, 'The renovated Ragusa.' But the most interesting production of this period is a collection of national songs, published by the Franciscan monk, And. Cacitch Miossitch.⁸⁵ This work, although executed with little critical taste or judgment, and disfigured by many interpolations, might have given to the literary world a foretaste of the treasures, which fifty years afterwards were to be discovered here.

Whilst Slavic poetry found so many votaries among the Dalmatians, it is a remarkable fact, that all their historians wrote in Latin or Italian. They possess indeed a very old chronicle, of the date of A. D. 1161, written in the Slavic language by an anonymous Presbyter of Dioclea, and translated by himself into Latin; but in the more flourishing period of the Dalmatian literature, the love of their own language was overcome by the stronger desire of a more universal reputation than any works written in Slavic could procure for them. The names of N. Ragnini, Francisco Gondola, Razzi, and Caboga, must here be mentioned. The dialect of the country, however, found some advocates even among the clergy. For some theological works it was preferred to the Old Slavonic; or at least the Latin letters were chosen for this language instead of the Glagolitic types. An Old Slavonic translation of the Gospels and Epistles by Bernardin de Spalatro was printed with Latin letters, Venice 1495. At the same place appeared, in 1613, Bandulovitch's translation of the same holy books in the common language. A Jesuit, Barth. Cassio, A. D. 1640, had translated both the Old and New Testaments; but the printing of it was prevented by the bishops. Anton Cacitch wrote a work on moral theology, in the common dialect of the country; and several ecclesiastics of high standing published works for religious instruction in the same language. The period following the catastrophe of Ragusa, was fertile in theological, or rather religious, productions. The works of the archdiaconus Albertus, of Gucetitch, and oth-

⁸⁵ *Razgovor ugodni naroda slavinskoga*, Venice 1759. A new edition appeared in the year 1811.

ers, contain treatises for spiritual edification, devotional exercises, etc. Biankovitch, bishop of Makarska, wrote a treatise of christian doctrine, Venice 1708, in the common Dalmatian dialect. But this dialect found its most ardent champion in a priest, Stephan Rosa, who exerted himself greatly to have the Old church Slavonic entirely superseded by the Dalmatian-Servian language. He made a complete translation of the whole Bible, and sent it to the pope, requesting that it might be printed and introduced under his high authority instead of the Cyrillic Bible. At the same time, he proposed that the mass should be read in the Dalmatian dialect, dwelling especially on the circumstance, that the Cyrillic language was an ingredient of the Greek church, and consequently the use of it in sacred things a species of Greek heresy. The pope appointed a committee to examine the new translation; the result of which was, as may easily be supposed, the rejection of a measure which savoured so strongly of Protestantism. From the time of this decision in A. D. 1754, nothing was done to provide the catholic inhabitants of Dalmatia, Bosnia and Slavonia with a version of the Bible, until at last a new translation, the first satisfactory one in the language, made by the Franciscan monk and professor Katancsich, was accepted and introduced in 1832. The merit of having procured it to be printed and published, belongs to the late primate of Hungary, cardinal Rudnay.⁸⁶

The inconvenience of such an anarchical state of orthography, and likewise in part of the grammar itself, must of course have been felt very early; but it would seem that in this department also, the Dalmatian writers acted with more zeal and diligence, than success. The above-mentioned Barth. Cassio, and after him another Jesuit, J. Micalia, endeavoured in the first half of the seventeenth century to settle the orthography and subject it to fixed rules. Ardelio della Bella, a member of the same order, published in 1728 a dictionary and grammar, in which he abandoned the way opened by his predecessors, without however finding a better one. Jos. Voltiggi endeavoured to establish a third system of pronunciation and orthography; his dictionary and grammar appeared in the year 1803. A few years later was published the great dictionary of J. Stulli, a work of considerable merit, and far excelling all previous works of the same

⁸⁶ See Biblical Repository, Vol. III. p. 186, where extracts are given from a letter of M. Kopitar to the Editor.

kind. A useful grammar was also published about the same time, by Appendini.⁸⁷

Literature of the Catholic Slavonians.

The Slavonians of the Greek church make use of the Cyrillic letters; and their productions belong therefore to that division of Servian literature.* We have seen above, that the catholic Slavonians also neither speak nor write a different dialect; but that only their mode of writing, the strange combination according to which they express the sounds of the same language, separates them from the Dalmatian Servians.† To enter into the details of these varieties would be of little interest for our readers.

The light of the Reformation penetrated at an early day into Slavonia, and gave birth to a kind of limited theological or ecclesiastical national literature. But the catholic clergy soon succeeded in extinguishing it; and in the same proportion, the Latin language continued to supersede the dialect of the people. In more modern days, the Latin has been preferred by nearly all catholic Slavonian writers; and their own literature is now almost exclusively limited to works for religious instruction, catechisms, prayer-books, etc.

But although their language was thus relinquished in a practical point of view, it remained nevertheless the object of investigation to some of their profoundest scholars. Thus the Latin works of Prof. Katancsich, are almost all of them devoted to Slavic-philological inquiries, etc. The translation of the Bible mentioned above, was made by the same learned individual.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ F. Verantii *Dictionarium quinque nobiliss. Eur. Ling. Lat. Ital. Germ. Dalm. et Ung.* Venice 1595. Micalia *Thesaurus linguae Illyricae*, etc. Ancona 1651. Della Bella *Dizionario It. Lat. Illyr.* Venice 1728; later edit. Ragusa 1785. Voltiggi *Riccosloovnik illyricsistoga, ital. i nimacsk*, Vienna 1803. Stulli *Lexicon Lat. Ital. Illyr. etc.* Buda and Ragusa 1801—10, 6 vols. Prefixed to the four last works, are also grammars. Other Dalmatian grammars are: Cassii *Institutiones linguae Illyricae*, Rome 1604. Appendini *Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache*, Ragusa 1808. Starcevich *Nuova Gramm. Illyrica*, Trieste 1812.

* See above in § 1. a, p. 393.

† See p. 403 above.

⁸⁸ As dictionaries and grammars of this dialect are to be mentioned: Relcovich *Deutsch illyrisches and illyr. deutsches Wörterb.* Vienna 1796. By the same: *Neue Slavonisch-deutsche Grammatik*, Agram 1767. Vi-

IV. *Language and Literature of the Croations.*

In our historical introduction, we have enumerated the Croations, or Croats, as a distinct Slavic branch; following in this the high authority of Dobrovsky and several others. There is however such a confusion in the early history of this race, such a change of names, boundaries, and constitutions, such a contradiction between the accounts of ancient writers and the experience of modern times, that it would require a long historical exposition to give to the reader a clear view of their relation to each other and to their Slavic brethren. For such an exposition there is no room in these pages.⁸⁹ The subject becomes far simpler, if we consider the Croats only in respect to their language, as it prevails among them at the present time. Here they do *not* appear as a distinct race; but still are divided into two portions. One, in Military Croatia, comprising the military districts of Carlstadt and Varasdin, and also the Banal Border, speak the Dalmatian-Servian dialect with very trifling variations; the other, in Provincial Croatia, i. e. the provincial counties of Agram, Kreutz, and Varasdin, approach nearer to the Slovenzi or Vindes, whose language will be the subject of our next section.* The dialect of this latter division of the Croations forms, indeed, in a certain measure, the transition and connecting link between the Dalmatian-Servian and the Vindish languages.

We have mentioned above,† that the Croations adopted a system of writing different from that of the Dalmatians. The earliest documents of their literature are out of the sixteenth century, and all belong to the history of the Reformation. Here also the new doctrines found minds willing to receive them; and

enna 1774. Buda 1789. Lanossovich *Einleitung zur Slav. Sprache*, several editions from 1778—1795.

⁸⁹ See the second volume of Engel's *History of Hungary* etc. Katancsich *Specimen phil. et geogr. Pannon.* etc. 1795. Schaffarik's *Geschichte*, etc. p. 226—31, 235, 265.

* These two divisions of Military and Provincial Croatia constitute the modern Austrian kingdom of Croatia, which is united with that of Hungary. Comp. For. Quart. Review, Vol. VII. p. 423 sq.

† See p. 403 above.

as several of the *magnates*, among whom is the illustrious name of Zriny, were also their supporters, there was no difficulty in establishing a press, in order to diffuse the new light with greater speed and certainty. In the course of the last half of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, a large number of Croatian books, catechisms, postillae, etc. were printed. One of the warmest champions of the Reformation, was Michael Buchich, curate of the island Murakoz, who publicly adopted the Calvinistic confession, and endeavoured to spread abroad his own convictions by sermons and writings. Persecuted by the bishops, condemned by synods, he and his followers found some protection in the christian tolerance of the emperor Maximilian II. But the successors of this prince thought otherwise; and the most powerful of the Hungarian noblemen took arms for the defence of the catholic religion. At the diets held in 1607 and 1610, destruction was sworn to the new doctrines and to their adherents; and all steps were taken for the fulfilment of the oath.

In the middle of the seventeenth century, all Croatia had reverted to Romanism. From that time onward, for more than fifty years, there was not a thought of cultivating the language of the people; all books were again written in Latin, and are so mostly even to the present day. The first who interested himself anew for the foundation of a national literature, was Paul Ritter, or Vitezovich, d. 1713, who procured a printing office to be established by the estates, and himself wrote several books in the Croatian language. A few writers followed his example; but the activity of the press was and is now almost exclusively devoted to the printing of the ordinary catholic books for spiritual edification and religious instruction. The Gospels are extant in the Croatian dialect; but not the whole Bible. Most of the Croats, however, are able to read and understand the books of their Dalmatian neighbours.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Croatian philological works are: *Einleitung zur croat. Sprachlehre*, Varadin 1783. Kornig's *Croat. Sprachlehre*, Agram 1795. Gyurkovschky's *Croat. Grammatik*, 1825. Habelich *Dictionarium croat. lat.* Graetz 1670. Bellosztenecz *Gazophylacium s. Latino-Illyricor.* etc. Agram 1740. Jambressich's *Lex. Lat. interpr. illyrica, germ.* etc. Agram 1742.

V. Language and Literature of the Vindes or Slovenzi.

The Slavic inhabitants of the Austrian provinces Carinthia, Carniola, and Stiria, and of the Hungarian counties Eisenburg and Szala, about 300,000 in number, call themselves *Slovenzi*. By foreign writers they have generally been called *Windes* or *Vindes*; a name, however, less definite and less correct; inasmuch as the specific appellation of Vindes or Vendes served in ancient times among the Germans as a general name for all Slavic nations. The Slavic settlements in Carniola took place at a very early period, certainly not later than the fifth century. In the course of the following centuries their number was increased by new emigrations from the south-east; and they extended themselves into the lower parts of Stiria and Carinthia, and the western counties of Hungary.*

In regard to the language of this people, it was formerly considered a matter of certainty, that it had never been a written language before the time of the Reformation. But the investigations of modern philologists have proved, on the contrary, that this portion of the Slavic race was earlier acquainted with the art of writing than were any of the other branches; probably even before the time of Cyril; and since the discovery of several very old manuscripts in the library of Munich, every doubt of this fact has been silenced. According to Kopitar,† the true home of the Old Slavic church language is to be found among the Pannonian and Carinthian Slavi; and it was for them that the Old Slavonic Bible was translated. The liturgy of Methodius was, however, soon supplanted by the Latin worship; which at any rate must have been earlier established in this part of the country; since Christianity appears to have been introduced about the middle of the eighth century, by German priests.

Be this as it may, the definite history of the language begins only with the Reformation; and it is principally to the exertions of one distinguished individual, that it owes its introduction into the circle of literature. There is nothing more pleasing in the moral world, than to behold the whole life of a man devoted to one great cause, his thoughts all bent on one great object, his exertions all aiming at one great purpose; and so much the more, if that object has respect to the holiest interests of man-

* See Engel etc. III. p. 469.

† See the *Wiener Jahrbücher*, 1822, Vol. XVII.

kind. Such was the case with the *primus* Truber, who may be called the apostle of the Vindes and Croations. The direct results of his labours long ago perished in the lapse of time ; but this does not render them less deserving, although it diminishes his fame. Truber, born A. D. 1508, canon and curate at several places in Carniola and Carinthia, seems to have been early in life impressed with the truth of the new doctrines of the Reformation. His sound judgment taught him, that the surest way of enabling his flock, and the common people in general, to receive the new light in a proper spirit, would be the diffusion of useful knowledge among them. And as the German, which at the present day is almost exclusively the language of the cities of Stiria, Carniola, and Carinthia, was at that time far less generally understood, he ventured to commit to paper a dialect apparently never before written. In the second edition of his New Testament, A. D. 1582, he states expressly : "Thirty-four years ago, there was not a letter, not a register, still less a book, to be found in our language ; people regarded the Vindish and Hungarian idioms as too coarse and barbarous to be written or read."

Truber and his assistants in this great work of reformation and instruction, among whom we mention only Ungnad von Sonnegg and Dalmatin, met everywhere with opposition and persecution ; but their activity and zeal conquered all obstacles, and succeeded in at least partially performing that at which they aimed. Meantime, Christopher, duke of Würtemberg, a truly evangelical prince, had opened, in his dominions, an asylum for all those who had to suffer elsewhere on account of their faith. The translation of the Scriptures everywhere into the language of the common people, was regarded by this prince as a holy duty ; and this led him to cause even Slavic printing-offices to be established in his dominions. Thither Truber went ; and after printing several books for religious instruction, he published the Gospel of Matthew in a Vindish translation, Tübingen 1555 ; and two years later the whole New Testament. As Truber did not understand the Greek original, his translation was made after Latin, German, and Italian versions. At the same time a translation for the Dalmatic-Croations was planned ; and several works for their instruction printed and distributed. Truber, thus an exile from his own country, died in 1586 as curate in the duchy of Würtemberg, engaged in a translation of Luther's House-postillae.

Two different systems of orthography had been adopted by Truber and Dalmatin. For this reason, when in 1580 the whole Vindish Bible was to be printed at Wittemberg, it seemed necessary to fix the orthography according to acknowledged rules. This led also to grammatical investigations. In the year 1584, a Vindish grammar was printed at Wittemberg, the author of which, A. Bohorizh, of Laibach, was a pupil of Melancthon, and a scholar of that true philosophical spirit, without which no one should undertake to write a grammar, even where he has only to follow a beaten path; much less when he has to open for himself a new one. Thus the Vindish written language, almost in its birth, acquired a correctness and consistency, to which other languages hardly attain after centuries of experiments, innovations, and literary contests. According to the judgment of those who are best acquainted with it, the Vindish language has undergone no change since the time of Bohorizh,—a fact indeed scarcely credible; and the less so, because during that whole interval it has been maintained almost exclusively as a spoken language. About thirty years after the publication of this grammar, the catholics, sheltered by the despotic measures of the archduke Ferdinand, afterwards the emperor Ferdinand II, gained a complete victory. All evangelical preachers, and all protestants who faithfully adhered to their religion, were exiled; their goods confiscated; and, more than all, their books *burned*, and their printing-office in Laibach destroyed.⁹¹ Fragments of the Gospels and of the Epistles were however printed at Graetz, in 1612, for the Slavic catholics in their own language.

A whole century passed, and the Vindish language seemed to be entirely lost for literature and science. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, an academy was founded by some learned men of Carniola, on the plan of the Italian Academy; and some attention was again paid to the language of their forefathers. In A. D. 1715 a new edition of Bohorizh's work, with several alterations and without mentioning the true author, was printed by a capuchin, P. Hippolytus; who left also in manuscript a Vindish dictionary, the first in that language. Fifty-

⁹¹ Schaffarik observes, p. 283, "The public library in the statehouse was delivered to the Jesuits, who had just been introduced. The books which these did not commit to the flames on the spot, perished in the great conflagration in 1774, together with the edifice of their college. In all Carniola only two copies of Bohorizh's grammar are known to exist."

three years later, another grammar was published by the monk Marcus Pochlin; a work in itself, according to the best authorities, utterly void of merit, but which, from the necessity of the case, and for the want of a better, met with success, was reprinted in 1783, and remained in common use until the appearance of Kopitar's grammar. This work,⁹² written by one of the most eminent Slavists of the age, made a decided epoch, not only in the history of the Vindish language; but also, by its learned preface and comments, in the Slavic literature at large. Several grammatical works, not without merit, and for the most part founded on Kopitar's grammar, have since been published;⁹³ and since scholars like these are now occupied with the cultivation of the Vindish language, there exist for it and for its kindred dialects the happiest prospects.

The literature of a people, among whom every individual of any education may call another highly cultivated language in the fullest sense his own,—as is the case with the Bohemians and Slovenzi in respect to the German,—cannot be very extensive. There have, however, in modern times, been published several works of poetry and prose in the Vindish language; among the writers of which we can mention only the most distinguished. Such are, V. Vodnik, author of some collections of poems; Ravnikar, author of a biblical history of the Old and New Testament, and several works for religious edification; Farnik, Kumerdey, Popovich, etc.

But the most important work, both in a philological and moral point of view, is the translation of the whole Bible, set on foot by G. Japel, and executed by a society of learned men. This version being intended for catholics, was made from the Vulgate, and was published at Laibach 1800, in five volumes; the New Testament appeared also separately, in two volumes, Laib. 1804. A Slavic pulpit, which was established ten years ago at the same place, has also been of great service to the language.

The inhabitants of the provincial counties Agram, Kreutz, Varasdin, and the neighbouring districts, called Provincial Croa-

⁹² *Grammatik der Slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnthen, und Steyermark*, Laibach 1808.

⁹³ These are: V. Vodnik's *Pismenost ali gramm. soperve shok*, Laib. 1811. Metelko's *Lehrgebäude der Slovenischen Sprache*, 1825. Schmigoz *Theor. pract. wind. Sprachlehre*, Graetz 1812. P. Dainko *Lehrbuch der wind. Sprache*, Graetz 1824.

tia, who speak a somewhat different dialect of the Vindish language,* but are able to read this translation, have nevertheless several versions in their own dialect, "lying in manuscript, which are only waiting for some Mecaenas, or for some favourable conjuncture, in order to make their appearance."⁹⁴

The only portion of the Vindish race among whom the protestant religion has been kept alive, are about 15,000 Slovenzi in Hungary. Their dialect approaches in some measure to that of the Slovaks; and hence serves as the connecting link between the languages of the Eastern and Western Slavic stems. For them the New Testament exists in a translation by Stephen Kuznico, Halle 1771; reprinted at Pressburg, in 1818.

[To be continued.]

ART. V. LITERARY NOTICES.

By the Editor.

1. *Letters from Egypt and Nubia in 1828 and 1829*, by CHAMPOLLION. With six lithographic Plates. Paris, 1833. 8vo. Price, 7½ francs, or about \$1.50.

This is a collection of all the letters written by Champollion during his voyage and residence in Egypt. The first nine were published at the time in the *Moniteur* and other journals, and excited great interest. Prefixed is the plan of the voyage, as drawn up by Champollion before his departure, but never before published. The letters are accompanied by three tracts hitherto unpublished, viz. 1. A summary notice of the history of Egypt, prepared in Egypt for the viceroy Mohammed Ali.—2. A note addressed to the viceroy on the preservation of the monuments of Egypt.—3. Several Arabic letters addressed to Champollion by a governor of the country, and his answers.—The whole volume has been printed from autograph manuscripts of the author; and as there is scarcely a locality of Egypt and Nubia, of any celebrity, in respect to which information more or less extensive is not given,

* See p. 407 above.

⁹⁴ See Kopitar's Letter to the Editor, *Bibl. Repos.* III. p. 186.

the volume can hardly fail henceforth to become the guide of all who are pursuing similar researches.—*Journal Asiatique*, July 1833.

2. *Turkish-French Dictionary*, by Prof. KIEFFER. For a long time before his death, Kieffer had been occupied along with M. Ruffin, in the composition of a manual dictionary of the Turkish in French. So early as 1811, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs took an interest in the work; and caused the sheets, as they were prepared at Paris by Kieffer, to be transmitted by the government couriers to Constantinople, where they were revised by M. Ruffin and sent back with his corrections and additions. The manuscript of the work complete remained among the papers of Kieffer, and is to be immediately put to press under the superintendence of M. Bianchi, a distinguished scholar in Turkish. It is to be published in one large volume 8vo. and will contain the substance of Meninski's large lexicon, together with a Persian part, sufficiently extensive to permit students to dispense with a separate Persian dictionary.—*Ibid*.

3. *Greek Lexicon of Suidas*. A new edition of this work is announced for publication in 2 vols. 4to, under the editorship of Professor Bernhardt of Halle. The text will be that of the *editio princeps* of Milan, as being more accurate and complete than that of Küster. A critical apparatus of various readings, corrections, and illustrations, from the older grammarians and the works of Reinesius, Gronovius, Toup, Schweighäuser, Porson and others, will accompany the work. The Latin translation will be improved; and a suitable index and literary introduction will be added.—*For. Quart. Rev.* July 1833.

4. *Lettres Edifiantes*. A continuation of this celebrated work has been published under the title: *Nouvelles Lettres Edifiantes des Missions de la Chine et des Indes Orientales*, 8 vols. 12mo. Paris 1818—1823. Of the old collection of "*Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*," the work to which Europeans are most indebted for the knowledge they possess of China, as well as of the labours of the catholic missionaries in that country, the following literary notice is given in the *For. Quart. Review*, Vol. V. p. 487. "The publication of these celebrated Letters was commenced at Paris in 1702 by Legobien, who edited the first eight volumes. After his death, the editorship devolved on Duhalde, the well known author of the popular History of China, who carried on and completed the collection, of which the last volume appeared a short time after his death, A. D. 1743. Though Duhalde, who was well fitted to be the editor of such a work, performed his task with great taste and skill, it was soon found that in a new edition a much better arrangement might be adopted; and accordingly when the whole series was reprinted in 1781, Querbeuf the editor greatly improved

it, by throwing together all those letters which related to the same subject. Other improvements have been effected, and many additions made to the collection since that period, particularly in the octavo edition of 1810."

5. *Greek and Roman Antiquities*. Prof. Klotz and Dr Westermann announce at Leipsic a *Thesaurus Antiquitatis Graecae et Romanae ad literarum ordinem conditus*. It is to be in the manner of an Encyclopaedia, embracing the following departments: Literary History, Antiquities including Archæology, Mythology, Geography, and the History of Civilization; but Political History will be excluded. The names of several of the most eminent scholars are given, as having engaged to undertake certain portions of the work; viz. Hermann, Eichstädt, Jacobs, Böttiger, the Dindorfs, Schumann, Osann, Matthiae, Jahn, Ranke, A. G. Bekker, Nobbe, Kiessling, Weichert, etc.

6. *Armenian Literature*. A private letter in the (London) Quarterly Journal for Education, Jan. 1834, gives the following account of the printing-office in the Armenian convent situated on the small island of St. Lazarus, near Venice. After mentioning that the convent is the residence of sixty brethren and others, among whom are twenty-six boys, whose education is conducted by the monks, the writer remarks: "The printing-house attached to this monastery, which has already published several Armenian and Italian works of importance, is in full activity; it has three Stanhope presses, manufactured in Milan and Padua, which are constantly in requisition. They are employed at present on the 'Armenian-Italian' portion of the great dictionary edited by Tshia-tshink, who published the Italian portion of the work some years ago. The whole will extend to two quarto volumes; and the seventy-fifth sheet is already completed. The press is, at the same time, at work upon Elias Tomuglan's Armenian version of Plutarch's Lives, which will be comprised in six octavo volumes; three of which are already published. The work next in contemplation is the *Antichità d' Armenia*, from the Ms. of the late L. Ingigi; he left this important work in a perfectly complete state, and it will form three quarto volumes. It embraces not only the ancient and modern history of Armenia, but its general statistics, etc. and will fill up a great vacuum in Eastern literature."

7. *Oriental Languages*. The Lectures delivered in the Royal School for living Oriental Languages in Paris, are distributed as follows for the session of 1833—1834. *Arabic*, De Sacy; *Vulgar Arabic*, Caussin de Percival; *Persian*, Quatremère; *Turkish*, Am. Jaubert; *Armenian*, Le Vaillant de Florian; *Modern Greek and Greek Palæography*, Hase; *Hindustanee*, Garcin de Tassy; *Archæology*, Raoul Rochette. Each of these courses is continued three

times a week during the season, i. e. from December till July or August. Each lecture occupies about two hours. The place where they are held is a low, dark, dirty room in a building connected with the Royal Library, more plainly and even coarsely furnished than most of the common school-houses in this country. In 1829 the number of pupils in each of the two Arabic courses was from ten to fifteen ; in Modern Greek, from twenty to thirty.

8. *Göttingen*. The number of students at this University seems to have greatly diminished, in part, probably, on account of the political disturbances which occurred there two or three years since. During the summer semester of 1833, only 843 students were matriculated ; of whom 215 were in Theology ; 306 in Law ; 206 in Medicine ; and 114 in the faculty of Philosophy. At the end of November last, the number entered for the present winter semester was 833. In the summer of 1825 there were over 1500 students ; and in the winter of 1829-30, nearly 1300. *Comp. Bibl. Repos.* I. p. 27.

The second volume of Neander's History of the Planting and Progress of the Christian Church under the Apostles, is announced as published ; but has not yet been received in this country.

Of Lücke's Commentary on the Writings of St. John a new edition is in press. Part I, comprehending the Epistles, is published, and is said to have been wholly rewritten.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. XV.

JULY, 1834.

**ART. I. HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE SLAVIC LANGUAGE IN
ITS VARIOUS DIALECTS; WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.**

Continued.

B. WESTERN SLAVI.

I. History of the Bohemian Language and Literature.

Of all the Slavic languages, the Bohemian dialect with its literature is the only one which can, in the mind of the evangelical theologian, excite a more than general interest. Not so much indeed by its own nature, in which it differs little from the other Slavic languages; but by those remarkable circumstances, which in the night of a degenerate Catholicism, made the Bohemian tongue, with the exception of the voice of Wickliffe, the first organ of truth. Wickliffe's influence, however great and decided it may have been, was nevertheless limited to the theologians and literati of the age; his voice did not find that responding echo among the common people, which alone is able to give life to abstract doctrines. It was in Bohemia, that the spark first blazed up into a lively flame, which a century later spread an enlightening fire over all Europe. The names of Huss and Jerome of Prague can never perish; although less success has made them less current than those of Luther and Melancthon. In no language of the world has the Bible been studied with more zeal and devotion; no nation has ever been more willing to seal their claims upon the Word of God with their blood. The long contests of the Bohemians for liberty of conscience, and their final destruction, present one of the most

heart-rending tragedies to be found in human history. Not less ready to maintain their convictions with the pen than with the sword, the theological literature of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and the first twenty years of the seventeenth centuries, is of an extent, with which that of no other Slavic language can be compared. It is true, however, that most of these productions bear decidedly the stamp of the period in which they were written. Dictated by the polemical spirit of the age, and for the most part directed by one protestant party against another, there is very little to be found in them to gratify the Christian, or from which the theological student of the present day could derive any other than historical instruction. On the other hand, while the theological literature of all the other Slavic nations is almost exclusively limited to sermons, catechisms, prayer-books, and other devotional exercises, among the Bohemians alone do we meet with exegetical researches and interpretations, founded on a scientific examination of the original text of the Scriptures.

Having thus acknowledged the claims of the theologian first, we must add, that other departments of the Bohemian literature are equally rich, and most of them cultivated with a better taste. There is indeed hardly any science or art, in which the Bohemians have not to boast of eminent names. But the talent for which this nation is the most distinguished, is that of music. A fondness for music and a natural gift to execute it, is indeed common to all Slavic nations; but whilst their talent is mostly confined to a susceptible ear, and a skill in imitating,—for the Russians and Poles possess some celebrated musical *performers*, though very few distinguished *composers*,—the talent of the Bohemian is of a far higher order. He unites the spirit of harmony which characterizes the Germans, with the sweet gift of melody belonging to the Italians, and thus seems to be the true *ideal* of a complete musician. A great part of the most eminent names among German composers are Bohemians by birth; and there is hardly any thing which strikes the American and English traveller in that beautiful region more, than the generality of a gift so seldom met with in their own countries.

Bohemia, until the sixth century, was inhabited by a Celtic race, the Boii. After them the country was called *Boiohemum*, i. e. home of the Boii; in German still Böhmen.¹ The Boii were driven to the south-west by the Markomanns; the

¹ More generally contracted into *Böhmen*.

Markomanns were conquered by the Lombards. After the downfall of the great kingdom of Thuringia, in the middle of the sixth century, Slavic nations pushed forward into Germany, and the *Tchekhes* settled in Bohemia, where an almost deserted country offered them little or no resistance. The *Tchekhes*, a Slavic race, came from Belo-Chrobatia, as the region north of the Carpathian range was then called.² Their name has been usually explained from that of their chief, *Tchekh*; but Dobrovsky more satisfactorily derives it from *četi*, *čjti*, to begin, to be the first; according to him *Tchekhes* signifies much the same as *Front-Slavi*.³ The whole person of *Tchekh* has rather a mythological than a historical foundation. The whole history of this period, indeed, is so intimately interwoven with poetical legends, and mythological traditions, that it seems impossible at the present time to distinguish real facts from poetical ornaments. The hero of the ancient chronicles *Samo*, the just *Krok*, *Libussa* the wise and beautiful, and the husband of her choice, the peasant *Perzinislas*, all move in a circle of poetical fiction. There is, however, no doubt that there is an historical foundation for all these persons; for tradition only expands and embellishes, but rarely, if ever, invents.

What we have said in our introduction, in regard to the vestiges of an early cultivation of the Slavic nations in general, must be applied to the *Tchekhes* particularly.* The courts of justice in which the just *Krok* and his daughter presided, and which the chronicles describe to us, present indeed a wonderful mixture of the sacred forms of a well-organized society, and of that patriarchal relation, which induced the dissenting parties to yield with childlike submission to the arbitrary decisions of the prince's wisdom. According to the chronicles, so early as A. D. 722, *Libussa* kept a *pisak*, or clerk, literally *writer*; and

² The country along the banks of the Vistula. According to other writers, Belo-Chrobatia was the name of the country on both sides of the Carpathian chain. In some old chronicles the *Tchekhes* are said to have come from *Croatia*, which induced more modern historians to suppose them to have emigrated from the present *Croatia*; others suppose that under this name *Chrobatia* was understood.

³ In his essay *Ueber den Ursprung des Namen Čech*, Prague and Vienna, 1782. In his later works he confirms this opinion; see *Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und alten Literatur*, Prague, 1818, p. 65.

* See above, p. 333, 347.

her prophecies were written down in Slavic characters. The same princess is said to have founded Prague. A considerable number of Bohemian poems, some of which have been only recently discovered, are evidently derived from the pagan period. Libussa's choice of the country yeoman Perzmyslas for her husband, in preference to her noble suitors, indicates the early existence of a free and independent peasantry. All these scattered features are however insufficient to give us a distinct picture of this early period; and here, as among all other Slavic nations, history commences only with the introduction of Christianity. The small states originally founded by the Tcheckhes, were first united into one dukedom during the last years of Perzmyslas; while under his son Nezamysl, in the year 752, they are said to have first distributed the lands in fee, and to have given to the whole community a constitutional form.

The name of Boii, Bobemians, was transferred to the Tcheckhes by the neighbouring nations. They continued to call themselves Tcheckhes, as they do even now. The Moravians, a nearly related Slavic race, who probably came to these regions at the same time with the Tcheckhes, called themselves *Morawčik*,⁴ from *Morawa*, morass, a name frequently repeated

⁴ In writing Russian and Servian names, we have adapted our orthography to the English rules of pronunciation, so far namely as English letters are able to express sounds partly unknown to all but Slavic nations. The Poles and Bohemians however, who use the same characters as the English, have a right to expect that in writing their national names in the English language, their orthography should be preserved; just as it is in the case of the French, Spaniards, Italians, etc. No English writer would change French or Spanish names according to the English principles of pronunciation. We consequently alter letters only in cases where otherwise a foreigner, unacquainted with the Bohemian language, would find an absolute impossibility of pronouncing them correctly; following in this the example of most German writers, and of those Bohemian authors who write in German. Thus we put *i* for the consonant *j*, which the Bohemian uses, with a shade of pronunciation inexpressible by letters, for the vowel *i*; thus above, *Morawčik* instead of *Morawčjk*, etc. A few words will be sufficient to explain what else may be peculiar in their way of expressing sounds familiar to other nations; thus *č* is pronounced *tch*; *š* = *sh*; *ž* the same sound softer; *f* = *r* followed by a soft sibilant; *c* is in every case pronounced like *ts*; hence Janocky must be pronounced *Janotsky*; Rokycana, *Rokytsana*; Ctibor, *Tstibor*, etc. The vowels *a, e, i, y*, are every where to be pronounced as in *father, they, machine, frisky*.

in Slavic countries. Until A. D. 1029 they were as a people entirely separated from the Bohemians. They had formed different petty states; their chiefs were called *Knjazi*, like those of their eastern brethren. The ancient Moravia however spread far beyond the limits of the present country of this name, and extended deep into Hungary. Hence this portion of the Slavic race was also generally comprised under the name of the Pannonic Slavi. We have shown above, in the history of the Old Slavonic language, that Moravia, then for a short period a powerful kingdom, was the principal theatre of Methodius' exertions. As at this time Christianity had been already introduced into these regions, and the kings Rostislav and Svatopluk, as well as most of their subjects, were already baptized, it is very probable, that they were induced by motives of policy to send to Constantinople for a christian teacher. Oppressed by the Germans, the usurpations of whose emperors were in a certain measure sanctioned by the chair of Rome, they desired to secure for themselves in the Byzantine court a powerful ally. After the dissolution of the Moravian kingdom in A. D. 1029, the present Moravia fell to Bohemia; was separated from it repeatedly in the course of the following centuries; and at length, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, became together with this kingdom an ingredient part of the Austrian states.

The Moravians were among the earliest Slavic tribes converted to Christianity. As early as the seventh century a considerable portion of them were baptized by German priests. It was however not before the first half of the ninth century, that the first christian missionaries entered Bohemia. In the year 845, fourteen Bohemian princes were baptized at Ratisbon. In the year 894 the duke Borzivog, the head of the nation, received baptism; but his successors went back to idolatry, and with them the greatest part of the people. Christianity was not firmly established in these regions before the second half of the tenth century. At this time, the Slavic liturgy introduced by Methodius into Moravia, was already in some measure, by the indefatigable exertions of the Roman-German priesthood, superseded by the Latin worship. Thus it never was established in Bohemia; with the exception of a few churches, attached to convents founded expressly in memory of the Slavic saints, Jerome, Cyril, and Methodius. Their inmates however were expelled in favour of German-Bohemian monks, or they died; and with them disap-

peared every vestige of the innovations of Cyril and Methodius. Hence the Old Slavic language and the noble translation of the Bible extant in it, have exercised only an inconsiderable influence on the Bohemian idiom.⁵

Bohemia, under the sovereignty of her dukes, and from A. D. 1198 under that of kings, was independent of the German empire, or at least did not belong to its circles; it recognized however a kind of sovereignty in that powerful neighbour, and the kings of Bohemia deemed it an honour to belong to the seven Electors, who chose the worldly head of Christianity. In the year 1306, the last male descendant of Perzmislas was murdered. His house had reigned in Bohemia in uninterrupted succession, although the kingdom was properly not hereditary, but elective, like Germany, Hungary and Poland. After a short interval, the crown of Bohemia fell by succession to the house of Luxemburg, and thus became several times united with the Roman imperial crown. Under the emperor Charles IV, Bohemia rose to the summit of its lustre. It was he who founded, A. D. 1348, the university of Prague, the first Slavic institution of that description.⁶ Under his successor, Wenceslaus, the war of the Hussites began. In the year 1457, the Bohemians maintained their right of election by placing George Podiebrad, a Bohemian, on the throne. The wisdom and equity of this individual justified their choice. In A. D. 1527, Ferdinand I, archduke of Austria, was elected king, and from that time the Bohemians have never again been able to detach themselves from Austria; with the exception of a short interval, during which the unfortunate palatine Frederic, known in the history of the thirty years' war, was placed on their throne. During the fifteenth, sixteenth, and the first half of the seventeenth, centuries, Bohemia was almost without interruption the theatre of bloody wars and contests in behalf of their religious liberties. Then came the awful stillness of death, which reigned for more than an hundred

⁵ On the fate of the Old Slavic liturgy and language in Bohemia, see Dobrovsky's *Geschichte der böhm. Sprache*, etc. pp. 46—64.

⁶ According to the Pole Soltykowicz, Casimir the Great laid the foundation of the high school of Cracow, as early as A. D. 1347; but it is certain, that this institution was not organized before 1400; whilst the papal privilege granted for the University of Prague is dated A. D. 1347, and the imperial charter in A. D. 1348. Jerome of Prague, one of its most celebrated professors, was invited to Cracow in 1409 to assist in the organization of that institution.

years over this exhausted, agonized country. For its revival and its present comparatively flourishing condition, it is indebted to its own rich natural resources, and to the wiser policy and milder dispositions of the more recent Austrian sovereigns.

The Bohemian language is the common property not only of the Bohemians and the Moravians, constituting together about three and a half millions in number, but also of nearly two millions of Slovaks, those venerable remains of the ancient Slavic settlements between the Carpathian mountains and the rivers Theiss and Danube. This people, so nearly related to the Tchekhes, occupy the whole north-western part of Hungary, and are besides this, scattered over that whole kingdom. They *speak* indeed a dialect or rather several dialects, essentially different from the language spoken in Bohemia and Moravia; but the circumstance of their having, since the Reformation, chosen the Bohemian for their literary language, amalgamates their contributions to literature with those of the Bohemians, and gives them an equal right to the productions of these latter.

Of all the modern Slavic languages, the Bohemian was the first cultivated. Two bishops of Merseburg, Boso towards the middle of the tenth century, and Werner at the close of the eleventh, as also fifty years later another German priest, Bruno, were above all active in promoting the holy cause of Christianity by religious instruction. The application of Latin characters to Slavic words had been long since familiar to the German priesthood; inasmuch as very early attempts had been made to convert the subjugated Slavic tribes, scattered through the north of Germany.

They now were applied to the Bohemian, so far as writing was requisite for religious instruction. According to the old chronicles, there were even some regular schools erected in those early times, one at Budeč, near Prague, and another somewhat later in Prague itself, where Latin was taught. Be this as it may, the Latin and German languages had an early influence on the formation of the Bohemian. Many foreign words were adopted and amalgamated with the language; still more were formed from native roots, after the model of those two idioms. In later times this capacity of the Bohemian has been greatly improved; it being one of the few languages which, in philosophy, theology and jurisprudence, have not borrowed their terminology from the Latins and Greeks, but formed their own technical expressions for ideas received only in part from other nations. The

extraordinary refinement of the Bohemian verb we have mentioned in our characteristic of the Slavic languages in general.* In respect to free and independent construction, it approaches the Latin; by its richness in conjunctions it differs essentially from the Russian, and is able to imitate the Greek in all its lighter shades. Thus it yields neither in copiousness nor in pliability, neither in clearness nor in precision, to any other Slavic language; while in respect to lexical and grammatical cultivation it is superior to all of them. The Bohemian alone of all the Slavic languages, has hitherto succeeded in imitating perfectly the classic metres; although the same degree of capacity for them is acknowledged in the Southern-Slavic dialects.

After so much well deserved praise, we must also mention that in respect to sound, the reproach of harshness and want of euphony has been made with more justice to none of the Slavic tongues. It is true, that all the reasons by which we have above seen the Slavic languages in general defended,† apply with equal weight to the Bohemian in particular. It appears also, that this apparent harshness is more a production of modern times than a necessary ingredient of the original language; for the ancient Bohemian of legends and popular songs, sounds by far more melodious, and the dialects spoken by the Slovaks, which are kindred to the Old Bohemian, are full of vowels, and are even distinguished from the other Slavic tongues by diphthongs. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the accumulation of consonants, in which the Bohemian surpasses by far not the Polish, but the southern and eastern languages, and its peculiar preference of the vowels *e* and *i* over the fuller sounding *a*, *o*, *u*, do not add to the euphony of the language; although it seems singular to bring forward such a reproach against a people so distinguished for their musical talent.

The history of the Bohemian literature may be divided into five periods.

The *first* comprises the whole interval from our first knowledge of the Tchekhes to the influence of Huss; or from A. D. 550 to A. D. 1400.

The *second* period comprises a full century, from Huss to the general diffusion of the art of printing.

The *third* period, the golden age of the Bohemian literature, comprises about the same interval, and extends to the battle at the White Mountain, A. D. 1620.

* See above, p. 339, 340.

† See p. 343.

The *fourth* period, extends from the battle at the White Mountain to the revival of literature in 1774—1780.

The *fifth* period, covers the interval from 1780 to the present time.

FIRST PERIOD.

From the first settlement of the Tchekhes, A. D. 550, to John Huss, A. D. 1400.

Of the language of the Tchekhes as it existed when they first settled in Bohemia, nothing is left, except the names they gave to the rivers, mountains, and towns, and those of their first chiefs. All these names entitle us to conclude, that their language was then essentially the same as at the present time, though more nearly approaching the Old Slavonic. The first *certain* written documents of the language are not older than the introduction of Christianity. There were indeed discovered, about ten years ago, some fragments of poetry, which appear to be derived from the pagan period.⁷ The manuscript has been deposited in the Museum of Prague, and the high beauties and evident antiquity of these poems have secured them warm advocates and admiring commentators. But the circumstance that Dobrovsky doubts of their genuineness, induces us to regard this point at least as not incontestable. Another highly valuable fragment is the celebrated manuscript of Königinhof, discovered in the year 1817 by the librarian Hanka, half buried among rubbish and worthless papers.⁸ This collection, the genuineness of which is not subject to any doubt, contains likewise several poems, the orig-

⁷ First communicated in the periodical *Krok*, Vol. I. Pt. III. p. 48—61. Rokawiecki, Hanka, Čelakowsky, and Schaffarik, maintain their authenticity.

⁸ In a chamber attached to the church of Königinhof or Kralodwor. It was published by Hanka in 1819, with a translation in modern Bohemian and in German, under the title *Rukopis Kralodvorsky* or *Manuscript of Königinhof*. According to Dobrovsky, who formed his judgment from the writing, this remarkable manuscript belongs to the interval from about A. D. 1290 to A. D. 1310. From the numbers of the chapters and books into which it is divided, it appears that the collection comprised three volumes, and that the manuscript thus accidentally rescued from oblivion, is only a small part of the third volume. Goethe honoured it with his peculiar attention and applause. Bowring has given some pleasing specimens of it, in his essay on Bohemian literature in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, Vol. II. p. 151—153.

inal composition of which belongs evidently to the eighth or ninth centuries. But the manuscript itself is not older than the end of the thirteenth century, and cannot therefore be considered as a sure monument of the language in an earlier age. All these national songs have an historical foundation; they celebrate battles and victories, and their evident tendency is to exalt the national feelings. They have not that plastic and *objective* character, which makes Homer and the Servian popular epics so remarkable; and from which it appears that the poet, during the time of his inspiration, is rather *above* his subject; but like the Russian tale of Igor's Expedition and the heroic songs of Ossian, the epic beauties are merged in the lyric effusions of the poet's own feelings, who thus never attempts to conceal that his whole soul is engaged in his subject.

The oldest monuments of the christian age are the names of the days, which are of pure Slavic origin. Of the Lord's prayer in Bohemian, on comparing the oldest copy he could find among the ancient manuscripts, Dobrovsky presumes that the form must have been about the same in the ninth or tenth century; although the manuscript itself is somewhat later. A translation of the *Kyrie eleison*, ascribed to Adalbert second bishop of Prague, dates from the same time. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries many convents were founded and schools attached to them; German artists and mechanics and even agriculturists settled in Bohemia. The influence of German customs and habits showed itself more and more, and the nobility began to use in preference the German language. In the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, this influence increased considerably, and exhibited itself most favourably in the lyric poetry of the time, an echo of the German Minnesingers; many of the poets belonging like them to the highest nobility. Of all the Slavic nations, the Bohemian is the only one in which the flower of chivalry has ever unfolded itself; and the cause of its development here is doubtless to be sought in their occidental feudal system, and in their constant intercourse with the Germans. The natural tendency of the Polish nobility to heroic deeds and chivalrous adventures, was counterbalanced partly by the oriental character of their relation to the peasantry, which impressed on them at least as much of the character of the Asiatic satrap, as of the occidental knight; and partly by the want of a free middle class in Poland, as also in Russia. True chivalry indeed does not require simply the contrast of a low, helpless, and sub-

missive class; its lustre never appears brighter than when placed side by side with an independent yeomanry.

In calling the Bohemian lyric poetry of this age the echo of the German, we do not mean to say it was wanting in originality; but wish rather to convey the idea that the same spirit inspired at the time the Bohemians and the Germans, proceeding however from the latter, who themselves received it from the more romantic Provence. Of these heroic love songs very few are left. There are, however, several productions of this period, in which the German influence is not to be recognized at all, but which exhibit purely Slavic national features. We will here enumerate the monuments of the Bohemian language from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which have been preserved, before we pass to the fourteenth, which was more productive and exhibited in some measure a new character.

The most remarkable is the above mentioned manuscript of *Königinhof*. It contains, besides several epic songs partly complete and partly fragmentary, seven or eight charming lyric pieces. The near relationship of the Slavic nations among each other, is exhibited in no feature more strikingly than in their national popular poetry, especially in the little lyric songs, the immediate effusion of their feelings, wishes and cares; whilst epic poetry, which draws her materials from the external world, must hence, in every nation, be in some measure modified by their different fortunes and situations. With the exception of this manuscript and a few scattered love songs and tales, among which is also a piece of prose, a very rare appearance in these early times,⁹ all we have from this early period is of a religious character, viz. a fragment of a history of Christ's passion in rhymes, another of a legend of the twelve apostles, a hymn on the merits of the Bohemian patron saint, Wenceslaus, etc. and finally a complete psalter in Bohemian, and a whole series of hymns, or rather rhymed formularies, corresponding to those sung in the catholic church, i. e. a *Te Deum*, an office for the dead, a prayer for the intercession of all saints, etc. The first historians of Bohemia, Cosmas and Vincentius, born towards the middle of the eleventh century, wrote both of them in Latin. The chronicle of the first is still extant.

⁹ "Complaint of a lover on the banks of the Moldaw." The manuscript fell accidentally into the hands of the Polish scholar Linde, who knew how to appreciate its value. See Dobrovsky's *Geschichte der böhm. Spr.* p. 109.

During the fourteenth century the German influence increased so much, that the jealousy and impatience of a great part of the nation was powerfully excited. The king kept a German body guard ; German fashions in dress and manners prevailed at the court ; and even in the year 1341, when the privileges of the city of Prague were first solemnly committed to writing, it was done in the German language. Under the reign of Charles I, or the emperor Charles IV, for he united the two crowns on his head, Bohemia, as we have said, reached the highest point of its splendour. He wisely limited the privileges of the Germans in his own kingdom, and reconciled the minds of the Bohemians by granting to them similar privileges in the German empire. He honoured the Bohemian language so much, as to recommend expressly, in the golden bull, to the sons of the Electors to learn it. His capital, Prague, was like the apple of his eye, and he did all he could to add to its embellishments and magnificence. Here he founded in the year 1348 the first Slavic university, on the plan of those of Paris and Bologna. The influence of this institution, not merely on Bohemia, but on Germany and indeed all Europe, was decided. From the time of its foundation until 1410, it was the general resort for students from among the Poles, Hungarians, Swedes and Germans. It was doubtless the wish to give it this very kind of universality, which induced Charles IV, in the statutes of the institution, to allow to the Bohemians only one suffrage in the senate, and the three others to foreigners. We shall shew in the sequel with what jealousy this apparent preference was received by the natives, and what a violent reaction it caused in the Bohemian national feelings.

Experience every where teaches, that schools and academies never enkindle the spark of genuine poetry ; nay, that the erection of formal scientific institutions is even not favourable to the free developement of that high gift. In Bohemia too, the fourteenth century was indeed very productive in rhymed works ; but most of them were utterly deficient in real poetry. On the other hand, as the natural result of a more strictly logical and clearer mode of thinking, by reason of a scientific education, the style of the prose writings became more cultivated, concise, and distinct ; and the direction of mind more general and universal. We find in this period several historical works, viz. (1) A chronicle in Bohemian rhymes, extending as far as to 1313, written under king John, the father of Charles IV, when the in-

fluence of the German had reached its highest point. A glowing hatred against that nation dictated this work and made it for more than two hundred years the favourite book of the Bohemian people. The name of the author is not ascertained, although it has been usually ascribed to the canon Dalimil Mezericky.¹⁰ (2) Another Bohemian chronicle, written by order of Charles IV in Latin, but translated into Bohemian by Přebík Pulkawa. It was first published by Prochazka in the year 1786; the Latin original in 1794. (3) Martimiani or the Roman chronicle, translated A. D. 1400 from the German, by Beneš of Horowic. (4) Another chronicle of the Roman emperors, translated from the Latin by Laurentius of Brezow, the writer of several other works, partly printed in the course of the following centuries. There were also several collections of laws; among others the oldest Bohemian statutes, by A. of Duba, a valuable manuscript, preserved in the imperial library of Vienna; the common and the feudal law, translated from the Latin and kept in the library of Prague; the celebrated *Sachsenspiegel* or laws of Magdeburg, etc. The constant intercourse with foreigners directed the attention of the Bohemians early to the utility of acquiring other languages, and made the possession of their own valuable to foreigners. We find, consequently, not less than seven dictionaries, or vocabularies, as they were called, compiled in the course of this century; one of which, the so called *Bohemarius* of A. D. 1309, is even written in hexameters. As all these vocabularies are incomplete, and better ones, founded partly upon them, have been since compiled, they have never, so far as we know, been printed; but are extant in several copies, and are preserved in the libraries of Prague, Brünn, and several churches.

Poetry, during this century, took also in Bohemia the same course as in Germany, and degenerated into loose works of fiction between prose and verse, mostly allegorical compositions, and the basis of the modern novel. Such are *Tristram*, in 9000 verses, a translation from the German; the life of Alexander and the history of Troy from the Latin, both of them more

¹⁰ It was first published by Ješin, A. D. 1620; later by Prochazka, Prague 1786. The author did not spurn any means to reach his patriotic object, viz. to inspire his nation with hatred against the Germans. The most absurd fables came through him into the early history of Bohemia.

novel than history ; and a great number of similar works.¹¹ All other poetical productions of this century may be divided into fables, satires, and legends, or other allegorical pieces of an ecclesiastic-didactic tendency, as may be seen even from their titles ; e. g. the nine joys of Mary, the ten commandments, the five sources of sin, etc. All are equally deficient in poetical merit.

With what thoughts the minds of reflecting men and of the reading class were at this time chiefly occupied, and how well they were prepared to receive, in the beginning of the following century, the doctrines of Huss, Jerome, and Jacobellus, those teachers of a purer system of divinity, is manifested in some measure in the theological literature of the day. A treatise upon the great distress of the church, written by a clergyman called John Milič¹² before 1370 ; several others on the principal christian virtues ; a book of christian instruction written by Štitny, a Bohemian nobleman, for his own children ; a translation of the Jewish Rabbi Samuel's book on the coming of the Messiah ; and several similar works,—all these seem to indicate that the religious system of the day was no longer able to satisfy reflecting minds. We find also that the greatest part of the Bible was already extant in the Bohemian language in the second half of the fourteenth century ;¹³ although not yet collected to-

¹¹ The history of Troy was one of the first works which issued from the Bohemian press, about A. D. 1476 according to Dobrovsky, and again A. D. 1488, and 1603. It was published for the fourth and last time by Kramerius in 1790 ; see note 21, below. Even before it was printed, it appears to have been multiplied in a great many copies, as being a favourite book among the Bohemian knights and damsels. Its author was Guido di Colonna. See Dobrovsky's *Geschichte der böhm. Sprache*, etc. p. 155. Another remarkable production of the fourteenth century is *Thadleček*, the little weaver, the manuscript of which is extant in several copies, but which has been printed only in an ancient German translation ; see Dobrovsky, *ibid.* p. 157.

¹² This work was printed in 1542 ; it was put into the renowned *Index librorum prohibitorum*, first printed in 1629, and last in 1767, the original author of which was the famous Jesuit Konias, one of the most violent book-destroyers who ever lived. Not only all books written by the Hussites or their immediate predecessors, but even many catholic writers also, of that period, were put upon this list ; e. g. the historian Hagek, translations of Aeneas Sylvius, etc.

¹³ Ann, queen of England, sister to king Wenceslaus of Bohemia,

gether. Several translations of the psalter from this period ; also of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel ; and the Sunday lessons from the gospels ; are preserved in manuscript in the libraries of Prague, Vienna, and Oels in Silesia. Many others have doubtless perished in the lapse of time.

SECOND PERIOD.

From Huss, A. D. 1400, to the general diffusion of the art of printing, about A. D. 1500.

At the commencement of the fifteenth century, the university of Prague was in the zenith of its splendour. Several celebrated German scholars occupied the professors' chairs, and the average number of students was twenty thousand. No department of science was neglected ; each faculty had its distinguished teachers ; but it was theology which excited decidedly the warmest national interest among the Bohemians themselves ; it was theology in which the Bohemians maintained the first rank as teachers. The interest in spiritual things was no longer confined, as in former times, to those who intended to devote themselves to the clerical profession ; it pervaded all classes, high and low. Immediately after Wickliffe's death, an intercourse had been opened between England and Bohemia by the marriage of a Bohemian princess, Ann, sister of king Wenceslaus, to Richard II of England. A young Bohemian nobleman, who had finished his studies in Prague, repaired to Oxford, imbibed the sentiments and opinions of Wickliffe, and on his return, put a copy of all Wickliffe's writings into the hands of John Huss, at that time one of the professors of theology at Prague, whose mind was probably already prepared for them, and who began to study them with great zeal and devotion. Indeed, the pretensions of the chair of Rome and the corruption of the clergy, had been for some time since looked upon in Bohemia with private disgust and open disapprobation ; and when the professors Huss, Jerome, and Jacobellus, began to declaim against monks, auricular confession, and the infallibility of the pope, they found a responding echo in the breasts of their hearers ; and all that was novel in their doctrines, was the boldness with which they

possessed a Bible in Latin, German and Bohemian ; to which circumstance Wickliffe alluded in one of his writings, quoted by Huss in his reply to Stockes, Tom. I. p. 108. See Dobrovsky's *Gesch. der böhm. Sprache*, p. 142.

were pronounced, and the logical consistency with which they were justified.

Another difference of opinion, which tended greatly to augment the excitement then reigning at the university, was the contest between the two philosophical schools, viz. that of the Realists, who were defended by Huss, and the Nominalists, to which nearly all the Germans adhered. This contest became very soon a national affair; or more probably had its principal origin in the unjust privileges of the Germans and the jealousy of the Bohemians. The preference given to the former at the foundation of the university, viz. the possession of three out of the four suffrages in all matters determined by vote, became anew the subject of debate, and was more especially assailed by Huss, then rector of the university. After a whole year of resistance, the king at length yielded. A decree of A. D. 1409 ordained, that in future the proportion should be reversed, so that the Germans should possess only one suffrage, and the Bohemians three. For this victory of their national pride, the university, the city, nay the whole country, had to suffer severely. Immediately after this decision, the famous literary emigration took place. All the German professors and students left Prague at once. The immediate consequences of this step were, the foundation of the universities of Leipzig, Rostock, and Ingolstadt, and the building up of those of Heidelberg, Erfurt, and Cracow. Prague never again became what it had been; although it obtained a transient lustre through the victory itself, and the eminence and martyrdom of some of its national teachers. Before we proceed, we must devote a few words to the personal merits and fortunes of these latter.

John Huss was born A. D. 1373 at Hussinecz, a village in the southern part of Bohemia; from which he sometimes took the name of Huss of Hussinecz, or John of Hussinecz. Although without property himself, he was enabled, at the age of sixteen years, by the pecuniary assistance of the proprietor of his native village and some other patrons, to prosecute his studies at the university of Prague, where he distinguished himself by his diligence and abilities. In the year 1396 he was made master of arts, and two years later began to lecture on philosophical and theological subjects. In A. D. 1402 he was appointed curate and preacher to the chapel of Bethlehem at Prague, the duties of which office he united with his professorship. In the same year the queen Sophia chose him for her confessor. He thus

at once acquired an influence over the people, the students, and at court. It was about this time that he became acquainted with the writings of Wickliffe. In the year 1407 he began publicly to oppose and preach against the errors in doctrine and the corruption then reigning in the church. The archbishop of Prague, Zbyniek, an illiterate and violent man, whose ignorance had made him the laughing stock of the students, by whom he was called the Alphabetarius or A. B. C. doctor, collected two hundred manuscripts of Wickliffe's writings, and, without any further authority from the pope than his previous condemnation of them, committed them to the flames in the archiepiscopal palace. Huss, both in his lectures and sermons, not only blamed this act in strong terms, but translated the *Trilogus* and several other of Wickliffe's works into Bohemian, distributed them among laymen and females, and caused new Latin copies to be made. When the archbishop interdicted his preaching in the Bohemian language, Huss not only refused to obey, but continued to spread by all legal means those doctrines of Wickliffe which he approved. At the same time the first translation of the whole Bible—whether a collection of the parts already extant, or a new version, we are not informed—appeared, and was distributed in multiplied copies among the public. It does not appear whether this translation was prepared by Huss; but it is certain that he did what he could to promote its circulation. On such proceedings the catholic clergy could not look with tranquillity. Twice he was called to Rome; twice he disobeyed, and at length appealed to a general council. In consequence of his doctrines, and of some tumultuous scenes among his followers, the excess of which he himself highly disapproved, he was by a decree of pope John XXIII solemnly expelled from the communion of the church. Deeming himself no longer safe at Prague under the weak king, he retired to the territory of his friend and patron, Nicholas of Hussinecz, where he prepared new works, some of which are among his most powerful ones, and preached repeatedly in the open fields before an innumerable audience. Those of his works which caused the greatest sensation, were his treatise 'On the Church' and a pamphlet entitled 'The six Errors;' both of which he caused to be fixed on the walls and gates of the chapel of Bethlehem. Both were directed against indulgences, against the abuse of excommunication, simony, transubstantiation, etc. and above all against the unlimited obedience required by the see of Rome; maintaining

that the Scriptures presented the only rule of faith and conduct for the Christian.

In consequence of this conviction, the correction and distribution of the Bohemian Bible was his constant care. In all his Bohemian writings he paid an uncommon attention to the language, and exerted a decided and lasting influence on it. The old Bohemian alphabet, which consisted of forty-two letters, he arranged anew, and first settled the Bohemian orthography according to fixed principles.¹⁴ In order to render it more interesting and impressive to learners, he imitated Cyril's ingenious mode of giving to each letter the name of some well known Bohemian word, which had the same initial letter, e. g. H, *hospodin*, lord; K, *kral*, king, etc. Thus he devoted his whole life to the different means of enlightening his countrymen, and justly considered a general cultivation of the mind as the best preparation for receiving the truth.

Among the coadjutors of Huss, the most distinguished was Hieronymus von Faulfisch, more generally known under the name of Jerome of Prague; who was, like Huss, professor in the university. In erudition and eloquence he surpassed his friend; accorded with him in his doctrinal views; but did not possess the mild disposition, the moderation of conduct, for which Huss was distinguished. His hatred against the abuses of the catholic church was so violent, that he used to trample under his feet the relics regarded as holy by that church. He is even said to have once ordered a monk who resisted him, to be thrown into the river. He was so great an admirer of Wickliffe, several of whose writings he translated into Bohemian, that even when preaching before the emperor at Buda, he could not

¹⁴ The Bohemians, like the Germans, adopted the Latin alphabet; but the former, receiving it from the Germans, adopted it in the corrupted form of these latter, viz. they imitated the so-called Gothic characters, in which also all ancient Bohemian books are printed. In modern times the genuine Roman letters have nearly supplanted them; to which several different signs are added to adapt them to the Slavic sounds. The Bohemian alphabet can only be said to have forty-two letters, in so far as the same letter with or without a sign, e. g. *s* and *š*, can be considered as two different letters. The English alphabet would be almost without number, if all the three or four modes of pronunciation connected with one and the same letter in that language, were indicated by certain signs, and these signs made three or four letters out of one.

but interweave that reformer's doctrines in his sermon ; an imprudence which caused him to be arrested immediately afterwards at Vienna. He obtained his liberty in consequence of the solicitation of the university of Prague. He wrote several works in the Bohemian language, for the instruction of the people, hymns, pamphlets, etc. His reputation for erudition and extraordinary powers rests however more on the testimony of his cotemporaries, than on his works, of which very few remain.

Another active assistant of Huss, especially in his improvement and distribution of the Bohemian Bible, was Jacobellus of Mies, known under the name Jacobellus of the [sacramental] Cup, on account of his zeal for the general introduction of the communion in both forms. He wrote commentaries on some of the epistles, sermons, religious hymns, etc. He too was a professor in the university of Prague.

In the year 1414, Huss was summoned to appear before the council of Constance, to exculpate himself before the united theologians of all the christian nations of Europe. Without the least reluctance, and rather with rejoicing at the opportunity of justifying himself from the extravagant charges brought against him by his enemies, and of demonstrating publicly the truth of his doctrines, he obeyed this call. Provided with a safe conduct by the emperor Sigismund, and accompanied moreover by several Bohemian noblemen at the express order of king Wenceslaus, he undertook the journey without fear for his personal safety, and arrived on the fourth of November at Constance. Here, before he was permitted to appear in the presence of the general council, he had to undergo several private audiences before a few cardinals ; at one of which, about three weeks after his arrival, he was arrested, cast into prison, and without being tried or even heard, kept more than *six months*. When the news of this treachery reached Bohemia, it was felt by the whole people as a national insult. Three petitions signed by nearly the whole body of the nobility, were in the course of time successively tendered to the council ; and as the two first were without avail, the third was accompanied by one to the emperor, in which he was reminded of his broken word, in terms so strong, —he having pledged his imperial honour for the safety of Huss, —that at length the 5th of June was fixed for a public hearing. Here however every attempt of Huss, not merely to justify himself, but even to speak, was frustrated by the most indecent and tumultuous clamour of the assembled clergy, who loaded him

with invectives and reproaches. In the two following audiences he was indeed allowed a hearing, at the special demand of the emperor, who had been disgusted and offended by the indecent behaviour of the council. Huss was now permitted to justify himself at large upon all the forty articles brought against him, most of them founded on his writings by the frequent aid of the most unfair deduction; but although he exculpated himself completely from some of the charges, yet he himself acknowledged so many others, that the council could only be confirmed in its previous determination to condemn him as an obstinate heretic. A month was allowed him, to give in his final answer. During this time cardinals and bishops tried their eloquence to persuade him to recant; especially at the instigation of the emperor, who wished to save his life on account of his own pledged honour. But all these efforts could not move the faith nor firmness of this pious and heroic man; and on the sixth of July, A. D. 1415, he was unanimously condemned, ignominiously degraded from the office of a priest, and burned alive the same day. His ashes were thrown into the Rhine.¹⁵

His friend Jerome of Prague, on hearing of his dangerous situation, hurried to Constance, to assist and support him, without even waiting for a safe conduct from the emperor or council. In the vicinity of Constance he stopped, and tried all possible means to obtain some assurance for his personal safety. Not succeeding in this, he felt himself compelled by prudence to return, although slowly and reluctantly, to Bohemia. But on the road, in consequence of a dispute in which he became engaged with some bigoted priests, he was arrested by the duke of Salzburg and sent to Constance, where the same scenes were repeated before the council, as in the case of Huss. At his first ap-

¹⁵ The Bohemian writings of Huss are partly extant in manuscript, partly in single printed pamphlets, but have never been collected. They consist in sermons, hymns, letters to his friends, postillæ and other interpretations of the Scriptures, etc. His complete Latin works were first printed in Wittenberg 1558, and repeatedly afterwards. They contain many pieces which were originally written in Bohemian; as were also the letters, which Luther caused to be printed with a preface of his own, Wittenberg 1536. Luther translated several of his hymns. The letters written by Huss from the prison at Constance, are the expressions of a pure and elevated mind, and present the best evidence of his spotless christian character. Some of them might serve as beautiful specimens of the sublime.

pearance, a thousand voices exclaimed : Away with him ! burn him, burn him ! It is most melancholy to read in the reports of the time, that even this strong and pious man could have been terrified into temporary submission ; not by the prospect of death, which he met gladly, but by the horrors of a lonely and protracted imprisonment in a noxious dungeon. But his fortitude did not long abandon him ; tortured by his own conscience, he solemnly announced at the next audience his recantation ; and declared that of all the sins he had committed, he repented of none more than his apostasy from the doctrines he had maintained. In consequence of this he was subjected to the same condemnation as his illustrious friend ; and met his painful death with the same magnanimity and resignation. He was burnt the 30th of May, 1416.

The behaviour of both these eminent men ; the christian mildness with which they bore the infamous treatment of their enemies ; the generosity with which they forgave their persecutors ; the patience, nay cheerfulness of Huss, when during his imprisonment severe bodily sufferings united with the persecutions of his adversaries to make his life a heavy burthen ; the magnanimity and fortitude with which both of them submitted to their final fate, and maintained the truth of their religious opinions until the very moment of an excruciating death, praising the Lord with soul and voice,—all this presents one of the most affecting and at the same time elevating pictures which the history of martyrs has to exhibit. The eloquence of Jerome made a powerful impression on his enemies ; and there were some moments during his trial, when even his judges wished to save his life. The celebrated Poggio Bracciolini, one of the revivers of Italian literature, happened to be present at the trial and execution of Jerome ; and although not agreeing with him, or rather being indifferent in point of religion, the eloquence, magnanimity and amiable deportment of the unfortunate martyr, excited his sympathy and admiration in an uncommon degree. This is manifested in his letters to Leonardo Aretius ; who in his reply found it advisable to warn his friend, not to show too much warmth in this matter.¹⁶

The instigators of these cruel acts, when they kindled the sag-

¹⁶ These interesting letters, containing all the circumstances of Jerome's last days and death, his eloquent speeches before the council, and a full account of the despicable conduct of his accusers, may be found at large in *Shepherd's Life of Poggio Bracciolini*.

gots by which these two martyrs died, did not anticipate that the fire they had lighted, would spread over a whole country, and carry horror and devastation through the half of Germany. The war by which the disciples of Huss avenged him, was one of the most bloody and destructive known in history. The news of his death, when it reached Bohemia, touched the heart of every individual like an electric spark. But this is not our province. Keeping only our own object, the fate of the language and literature in view, we must refer the reader to the historical accounts of this distressing period, and limit ourselves to the mention of only those events which had an immediate influence on these two topics.

Under the guidance of Nicholas of Hussinecz, the friend and patron of Huss, in whom even his enemies acknowledged more a defender of the reformers, than a persecutor of the catholics; of žižka of Trocznow, a Bohemian knight of great valour but disgraced by cruelty; and, after the death of these two, under Procopius, formerly a clergyman; the Hussites carried their victorious arms throughout all Bohemia, into Silesia, Franconia, Austria, and Saxony, and made these unhappy countries the theatre of the most cruel devastations. If, divided into several parties, as they were, they were thus powerful, they would have been twice as strong, had they been united in the true spirit of Huss. But even as early as A. D. 1421 dissensions arose among them; and they finally split into several sects and parties, who mutually hated each other even more than they did the catholics. Among these the Calixtins or Utraquists, whose principal object was to obtain the sacrament in both forms; and the Taborites, who insisted on a complete reform of the church, were the two principal. The Calixtins comprehended the more moderate of the nobility and the wealthy citizens of Prague; between them and the catholics a compact was concluded at Basle, in A. D. 1434, by which a conditional religious liberty was granted to them, and they acknowledged the emperor Sigismund as their sovereign; the weak king Wenceslaus having died in 1419. The Taborites were unable to resist any longer the united power of both parties. They partly dispersed; the rest united in the year 1457, in separate communities, and called themselves United Brethren. Under the severest trials of oppression and persecution, the number of these congregations, the form of which was modelled after the primitive apostolic churches, rose in less than fifty years to two hundred. In the middle of the sixteenth century,

numerous emigrations to Prussia and Poland took place, where a free toleration was secured to them. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, their communities in Bohemia were finally dissolved. From the remnant of these persecuted Christians, who were called by the Germans, Bohemian or Moravian Brethren, has sprung the present community of United Brethren, often called in English, Moravians, which was founded at Hernhut in 1722, at first under the protection and ultimately under the patronage and direction of count Zinzendorf.

The consequences of the barbarous measures of the council of Constance became immediately visible. Even the common people began to shew an intense interest, in the numberless theological pamphlets which were published in Bohemia and Moravia for or against Huss. Among the former, one written by a female deserves to be distinguished. The copies of the Bohemian Bible became greatly multiplied; many of them were made by females; and Aeneas Sylvius takes occasion to praise the biblical erudition of the women of the Taborites, whilst the abbot Stephen of Dolan in Moravia, complains of their meddling in ecclesiastical affairs. In the revision of the text of the Scriptures, the clergy were indefatigable. From 1410 to 1486, when the Bible was first printed, at least four recensions of the whole Bible can be distinguished, and several more of the New Testament. The different parties of the Hussites were united in a warm partiality for their own language; the Taborites began as early as 1423 to hold their service in Bohemian. After the compact of 1434 the Calixtins also attempted to introduce the mass in their own language, an innovation which caused new disturbances and contests. Meanwhile the language of the country assumed gradually even among the catholics its natural rights; the privileges of the city of Prague, the laws of the painters' guild, the statutes of the miners, were translated into Bohemian. At the session of the Estates in Moravia in 1480, the Latin was exchanged for the Bohemian; in Bohemia itself not before 1495. The knowledge of the Bohemian language, which Albert duke of Bavaria had acquired at the court of king Wenceslaus, where he was educated, had a decided influence on the Bohemian Estates, when in 1441 they offered him their crown. Under George Podiebrad, a Bohemian by birth, this language even became that of the court. After the death of George, one of the reasons which led to the election of Vladislaus king of Poland, was, that the Bohemians "could hope to see elevated through

him the glory of the Bohemian nation and of the Slavic language."¹⁶ Under this king all ordinances and decrees were issued in the Bohemian language, which gained prodigiously in pliancy and extent by the application of it to different uses. The most favourable influence on its formation, however, was effected towards the close of the fifteenth century, by the custom which began to prevail, of studying the classics and of translating them with all the fidelity of which the idiom was capable. Thus fostered by judicious application and patriotic feeling, the Bohemian language approached with rapid steps the period of its *golden age*,—a time indeed, in a political respect, of oppression, war, and devastation; but affording a gratifying proof, how powerfully moral means may counteract physical causes.

At the head of the theological literature of this period may be named the *Life of Huss*, written by P. Mladienowic. Although, strictly speaking, not a theological book, yet this character was in some measure impressed upon it by the custom which prevailed for a time, of causing it to be read aloud in the churches, in order to communicate to the people all the circumstances of the martyr's death. Mladienowic, acting as a notary at Constance, had been an eye-witness of the whole transaction. Among the catholic theological writers of the day, Hilarius Li-tomiericky, d. 1467, Rosenberg bishop of Breslau, Simon of Tis-now, and others, wrote against the practice of communion in both forms. But they were inferior to their adversaries in talent, and still more in productiveness. Rokycana, archbishop of the Calixtins, d. 1471, Koranda, Miroš, and others, defended their right to the sacramental cup, and exerted their pens in doctrinal controversies with the other sects. The Bohemian Brethren, Paleček, Procopius, Simon, Miřinsky and others, wrote interpretations of portions of the Scriptures, polemical pamphlets, religious hymns, apologies, etc. partly printed, partly preserved in manuscript. In the contests of the different parties, the use of weapons of every description was regarded as lawful; and among them, satire and irony were employed with much skill and dexterity by the Hussites.¹⁷ Uric of Kalenic wrote a satirical

* See Dobrovsky's *Geschichte der böhm. Sprache* etc. p. 201.

¹⁷ In a polemic satirical pamphlet the question was started: "Master, tell me what birds are the best, those which eat and drink, or those which eat and do not drink? and why are those which eat but do not drink, enemies to those which eat and drink?" A Latin pamphlet

letter from Lucifer to Lew of Rožmítal. Bohuslav of Čechtic partly wrote and partly compiled the work: "Mirror of all Christendom," with many remarkable illustrations.¹⁸ The Bohemian brother Chelcický, d. 1484, called also the Bohemian doctor, because he did not understand Latin, and of course neither Greek nor Hebrew, undertook nevertheless, besides several other works, to write an interpretation of the Sunday Lessons of the Gospels. His most popular book, called *Kopyta*, i. e. "The Shoe-last," (being himself a shoemaker by trade,) which was much read by the common people, is no longer extant. A pamphlet of Martin Lupač, d. 1468, called "The Sprinkling-brush," was likewise in the hands of every body. This clergyman, however, acquired better claims on the gratitude of his contemporaries, by a careful revision of the New Testament, which he undertook with the aid of several learned friends. Indeed, both among clergymen and laymen, there was an ardent desire for the right understanding of the Scriptures; which induced many individuals, who were not satisfied with the existing Bohemian translations, to undertake the task themselves anew.

Out of this period alone the manuscripts of thirty-three copies of the whole Bible, and twenty-two of the New Testament, are still extant; partly copied from each other, partly translated anew; all however having been made from the Vulgate. The Bohemian versions made from the original languages belong to the following period.¹⁹

Although religion filled the minds of the learned during this period more than in any other, it did not absorb their interest so entirely as to occupy them exclusively. It could not, however,

which decided for those which do not drink, was followed by a Bohemian refutation.

¹⁸ This manuscript, one of the most remarkable of the age, is in the library of Jena. It has not less than eighty-eight pictures, partly on paper, partly on parchment; and besides this forty-one smaller figures, scattered through the text itself. See Dobrovsky's *Reise nach Schweden*, p. 7; also his *Geschichte der böhm. Sprache*, p. 235.

¹⁹ By whole Bibles are here intended also those manuscripts, of which, although in their present state incomplete, it is presumed that the missing parts were lost accidentally. The New Testaments also are not all of them perfect. Of single biblical books, manuscripts of the Psalms are found the most frequently. See Dobrovsky's *Lit. Magazin für Böhmen. Reise nach Schweden*, etc. p. 57. *Geschichte der böhm. Sprache*, p. 211.

be expected, that in the midst of such struggles, both political and religious, the minds of men could elevate themselves so far above their circumstances, as to look at any science or art in the light of its independent value. Poetry at least, with a few exceptions, was only regarded as the handmaid of religion. We find many books of legends, biographies of the fathers and saints, both prose and rhyme, written partly by catholic, partly by Hussite writers. The doctrines of Huss did not, like those of Luther a century later, shake the belief in saints. Dobrovsky mentions a very ancient printed work of 1480, in which the letters of Huss, his life by Mladienowic, and the letter of Poggio on the execution of Jerome, are annexed to a *Passional*, as such collections of the lives and sufferings of the saints are called. There is also an abundance of Taboritic war songs; many of them replete with life and fire. These appear to have been partly founded on ancient Bohemian popular songs; for there are passages in them which are also to be found in the old chronicles. Altered to suit the present circumstances, their effect must have been the more powerful by association. This period was also rich in religious hymns; most of them translated from the Bible as literally as the rhyme would permit. But no form of poetry was more used, and none operated more strongly on the minds of the people, than the satirical ballads, with which the streets and alleys everywhere resounded. All these productions are only remarkable, as characteristic memorials of the age. Hynek of Podiebrad, fourth son of king George, who was born A. D. 1452, a highly accomplished and amiable man, is named as one of the most distinguished among the Bohemian poets of the age.

Politics too united with religion. Stibor of Cimburg, a patriotic and distinguished nobleman, wrote in 1467 an ingenious work in the form of a novel, "On the goods of the Clergy;" Walecowsky wrote on the vices and hypocrisy of the clergy; and Zidek, in 1471, instructions on government. All these books were dedicated to king George, and the latter work was even written at his instigation. Hagek of Hodielin and Wlček, between 1413 and 1457, wrote strategetical works. Marco Polo's description of the East, and Mandeville's Travels, were translated from the Latin. Kabatnik, J. Lobkowic, and Bakalař, wrote descriptions of Palestine between 1490 and 1500; the two first in books of travels. Mezyhor wrote a journal of the travels of Lew of Rožmítal, whom he accompanied as jester through Europe and a part of Asia. Collections of statutes, of the decrees of diets, of

judicial decisions, and of other documents, were made by patriotic and sometimes eminent men ; and those merely extant in Latin carefully translated into Bohemian.²⁰ Thus they gathered materials for future historians, although in their own day the field of history was but poorly cultivated, or at least with no more than common ability ; for as to quantity, there is no want. Procopius, following out the example of Dalimil, wrote a new rhymed chronicle ; Bartoš of Drahenic wrote a chronicle extending from 1419 to 1443, in barbarous Latin, to which he added some notes in Bohemian. Several other chronicles, the authors of which are not known, serve as continuations of those of the preceding century, which were devoted to the affairs of their own country. The above mentioned Zidek, on the other hand, undertook to write a universal history, after the division of time, then customary, into six ages. This book forms the third part of his great work, "Instructions on Government," to which we above alluded. In this work the author seizes every opportunity to lecture to the king, to give him advice, and to rebuke him. According to Dobrovsky, his boldness not unfrequently degenerates into coarseness and insolence. It is an amusing reproach which among others he brings against the king, that he had not one camel, whilst Job had six thousand. The same individual wrote also a large work in Latin, a kind of Encyclopædia, the manuscript of which is in the library of the University of Cracow.

We finish the history of this period with a short account of the state of medicine and natural science in Bohemia. It is true, that the greater part of the learned men who wrote on these subjects, preferred the use of the Latin language. But many of them were in the habit of making at least Bohemian extracts or abridgements of their most popular works, or sometimes had the whole of them translated by their pupils. Among the medical writers of this time, Christian Prachatitzky a clergyman, John Černý and Claudian Bohemian brethren, Albik and Gallus, must be mentioned ; the two latter wrote only in Latin.

This section of the Bohemian literature is particularly rich in herbals. Several works of instruction in botany were also writ-

²⁰ Vict. Corn. of Wšehrd composed in 1495 a work in nine books, "On the Statutes, Courts of justice, and Legislature (Landtafel) of Bohemia," which is the most celebrated among several similar works of this period, and was in its time indispensable to the Bohemian lawyer. The same learned individual translated Cyprian, Chrysostom, etc. See Dobrovsky's *Geschichte der böhm. Sprache*, etc.

ten. A manuscript of 1447, "On the inoculation of Trees," may be mentioned here, although belonging rather to the department of agriculture.

The Bohemian language, although improving and evidently rising in esteem with every lustrum of the fifteenth century, had however not yet supplanted the Latin. Many of the most eminent among the learned of this period preferred still to write in Latin; as Hieronymus Balbus, Bohuslav, Hassenstein of Lobkowic, Šlechta, Olomucius, and a number of others, who all contributed nevertheless to elevate the glory of the Bohemian name, and could not but exert a powerful influence on the nation.

In respect to the date of the introduction of printing into Bohemia, the first regular printing establishment at Prague, is not older than A. D. 1487. Several Bohemian books, however, were printed before this time by travelling artizans. In regard to the first work printed in the Bohemian language, historians are not entirely agreed. According to Jungmann,²¹ a letter from Huss to Jakaubeck, of 1459, was the first specimen of Bohemian printing; the above-mentioned chronicle of Troy of 1468 the second; and the New Testament of 1475 the third. According to Dobrovsky, the New Testament of 1475 is the earliest printed work in Bohemian. From that year to 1488, only seven Bohemian works appear to have been issued from the press, among which was a Psalter and another New Testament. In 1488, after the foundation of a regular printing office, the whole Bohemian Bible was printed for the first time; in the same year the History of Troy again, and the Roman chronicle; and in the following year the first Bohemian almanac, and the Bible of Kuttenberg. The subsequent editions belong, as to time, to the following period; but are given in the note below.²²

²¹ See his *Historie literatury česke*, etc. Prague 1825, p. 49, 68. Schaffarik agrees with him. Pelzel presumed that the letter of Huss, of 1459, was printed in some foreign country by a travelling Bohemian.

²² Other Bohemian Bibles are: Venice 1506, fol. Prague 1527, fol. ib. 1537, fol. Nürnberg 1540, fol. Prague 1549, fol. ib. 1556—57. ib. 1561 fol. the same edition with a new title. ib. 1570, fol. Kralic 1579—98, 6 vols. sm. fol. prepared by the United Brethren, the first from the original languages. Without place, 1596, 8vo. by the same. Without place 1613, fol. by the same. Prague 1613, fol. for the Utraquists. Prague N. Test. 1677. Old. Test. 1712—15, 3 vols. fol. for catho-

THIRD PERIOD.

Golden age of the Bohemian Literature. From the diffusion of printing, about A. D. 1500, to the battle at the White Mountain, A. D. 1620.

It is chiefly for the sake of clearness and convenience, that writers on the literary history of Bohemia separate this period from the former; in its character and its genius it was entirely the same. What the Bohemians had *acquired* in the one, they *possessed* in the other; what they had only aimed at in the former, they reached in the latter; what had been the property of a few, was now augmented by an abundant harvest in their diligent hands, and enriched a multitude. But the objects, the stamp, the character, of both centuries were essentially the same. Literary cultivation, which during the sixteenth century was everywhere else monopolized by the clergy and a few distinguished individuals, was in Bohemia the common property of the people, who for the most part embraced the evangelical doctrines in their manifold, though but little differing shades. But although religion was to them the object of chief interest, it was yet far from occupying their minds exclusively. And this is the point, in which the history of the Bohemian reformation materially differs from that of the other protestant nations or sects. In other countries, reformers have usually been led by circumstances to shew themselves decidedly opposed to the cultivation of elegant literature and the fine arts; they have destroyed or banished pictures, music, statuary, and every thing which they could in any way regard as worldly temptations to allure men from the only source of truth and knowledge; nay, the more rigid and zealous have sometimes gone so far as to look at the severe sciences themselves only in the light of handmaids to religion, and to deem a devotion to them without such reference as sinful worldliness. Of such fanaticism, we do not find a trace in the fathers of the Bohemian reformation, who were themselves men of high intellectual cultivation; and even their most zealous followers kept themselves nearly free from it. If, as we have seen in the pre-

lica. Halle 1722, 8vo. for protestants. Halle 1745, 8vo. for the same. Halle 1766, 8vo. for the same. Prague 1769—71, 3 vols. fol. for catholics. Prague 1778—80, 2 vols. 8vo. for catholics. Pressburg 1786—87, 8vo. for protestants. Prague 1804, 8vo. for catholics. Berlin 1807, 8vo. by the Bible Society. Pressburg 1808, 8vo. for protestants. Berlin 1813, by the Bible Society.

ceding period, political, poetical, and religious subjects were merged in each other, it was only the necessary result of the confusion occasioned by the struggles of the time. Where one object is predominant, all others must naturally become subordinate; but wherever that which appears amiable only as the free tendency of the whole soul, is exacted as a duty, a spiritual despotism is to be feared; of which we find very little in the history of Bohemian literature. The classics never were studied with more attention and devotion, were never imitated with more taste. Italy, the cradle of fine arts, and then the seat of general cultivation was never visited more frequently by the Bohemian nobility, than when three fourths of the nation adhered to the protestant church. At the same time too when the Bohemian protestants had to watch most closely their religious liberties, and to defend them against the encroachments of a treacherous court, they did not deem it a desertion of the cause of religion to unite with the same catholics, whose theological doctrines they contested, in their labours in the fields of philology, astronomy, and natural philosophy.

The extent of the Bohemian national literature increased during the sixteenth century so rapidly, the number of writers augmented so prodigiously, and the opportunities for literary cultivation presented to the reading public by the multiplication of books through the press, became so frequent, that the difficulty of giving a condensed yet distinct picture of the time, is greatly augmented. A sketch of the political situation of the country may serve as a back ground, in order by its gloomy shades to render still brighter the light of a free mental developement.

After the death of George Podiebrad in 1471, the Bohemians—or rather the catholic party, after the pope had excommunicated this prince,—elected Vladislaus, a Polish prince, for their king, who like his son and successor Louis, united on his head the crowns of Hungary and Bohemia. The different evangelical denominations were during these reigns in some measure tolerated; except that from time to time a persecution of one or another sect broke out, and again after a year or two was dropped, when the minds of the community had become somewhat pacified. It is a melancholy truth for the evangelical Christian, that at this time the most violent persecutors were to be found among the Calixtins or Utraquists. During the first years of the sixteenth century, persecution was mostly directed against the United Brethren and their writings. The latter were burn-

ed, the former banished, until driven from place to place they found an asylum in the territory of some high minded nobleman, where they established themselves anew, until after some years perhaps a new persecution began. Of a more revolting and bloody description were the measures directed principally against the Lutherans in the years 1522—26, in which the most shocking tortures were employed and several faithful Lutherans and Picardites burned alive. During all this time the catholics and Calixtins exercised a severe censorship; and it was ordained, that every individual who brought a new printed book into the city of Prague, must submit it to the revision of the consistory. These laws however were no better observed than all similar ordinances, when directly in opposition to the spirit of the age. Meanwhile the Calixtins and catholics, although writing against all the others, had their own mutual contests. When however the former caused a new edition of the Bible to be printed in the year 1506,²³ it was unanimously adopted by the catholics also; who, as is amusing to observe, did not notice that a wood cut is appended to the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse, in which the pope is represented in the flames of hell.

In the year 1526 king Louis died in the battle of Mohacz. According to a matrimonial treaty, he was succeeded by his brother in law, Ferdinand archduke of Austria, brother of the emperor Charles V. This prince was received by the Bohemians with reluctance as their king, and only on the condition, insisted on by the estates, that he should subscribe the compact of Basle, by which their religious liberties were secured to them. So long as Ferdinand was occupied in Hungary against the Turks, all went well in Bohemia; but when, in the war which followed the league of Smalkalde, (1547,) the protestants of this country refused to fight against their brethren, a new and unremitted persecution began against all who could in any way be comprised under the name of *sectarians*. The compact of Basle was strictly only in favour of the Utraquists or Calixtins; the Lutherans and Taborites, or as they were then called, United Brethren, as also the Picardites and Grubenheimer, were considered as *sects*, and did not belong to the indulged.²⁴ Their

²³ At Venice; see the preceding note. Dobrovsky calls it a splendid edition, and thinks the reason why the Bohemians had it printed at Venice was, that it could not have been executed so well in Bohemia. *Gesch. der böhm. Sprache*, p. 343.

²⁴ The Picardites, or Picards, who are also called Adamites, exist-

churches were shut up, their preachers arrested, and all who did not prefer to exchange their religion for the Roman Catholic, were compelled to emigrate. The scene altered under Maximilian II, Ferdinand's successor, a friend of the Reformation, and in every respect one of the most excellent princes who ever took upon himself the responsibility of directing the destinies of a nation; to use Schaffarik's happy metaphor, the benefits of his administration fell on the field, which Ferdinand's strength had ploughed, like a mild and fertilizing rain. During his life, and the first ten years of his son Rudolph's reign, Bohemia was in peace; the different denominations were indulged; literature flourished, and the Bohemian language was at the summit of its glory. But we regret to add that the protestants, instead of improving this fortunate period, by uniting to acquire a legal foundation for their church instead of a mere indulgence depending on the will of the sovereign, lived in constant mutual warfare, and attempted only to supplant each other. An ordinance in 1586 against the Picardites, a name under which the Bohemian Brethren were then comprehended; and still

ed as early as 1421, when Žižka crushed them, without annihilating them entirely; the Utraquists detested them because they denied the doctrine of transubstantiation, although they agreed with them in their general principles. They were frequently confounded with the Taborites, among whom at last the remnants of them became lost. The Grubenheimer were the remnants of the Waldenses, who fled to Bohemia in the middle of the 14th century; where under persecution and ridicule, they used to hide themselves in caves, and pits, *Gruben*; hence their name. Under the shield of the Reformation they thought themselves safe, but met only with new oppressors and persecutors. There were numerous other sects, and still more different names of one and the same sect. A sect of the Taborites, for instance, founded by Nicholas Wlasenicky, were alternately called *Miculassenci*, (i. e. Nicolaites, the Bohemian form for Nicholas being *Miculass*), or *Wlasenitzi*, from his name, *Pecynowshi*, from the place of their meetings, and *Plachtivi*, i. e. the crying, from their manner. See Dobrovsky's *Gesch. der böhm. Sprache*, p. 234. It may be the place here to remark, that the Calixtins or Utraquists, although at first decidedly against the infallibility of the pope, nevertheless in forming the compact of Basle, submitted in the main to the doctrine of Rome, with these four conditions; viz. the free distribution of the Bible to the people; the administration of the sacrament in both kinds; reform of the clergy after the pattern of the apostles; and punishment for "mortal sins" in proportion to their enormity.

more the strict censorship introduced in 1605, first aroused them to unite their strength against oppression; and in 1609 they compelled the emperor to subscribe the celebrated *Literae Imperatoriae*, or edict, by which full liberty in matters of religion was secured to them. During the rest of this period, the protestants remained the ruling party. The university of Prague, by the side of which from A. D. 1556 another of the Jesuits existed, was by that treaty given entirely into their hands. This institution, although in consequence of the foundation of so many similar schools it never recovered completely from the shock it received in 1410, and though for more than a hundred years it had been decidedly on the decline, yet rose in reputation towards the middle of the sixteenth century; and among the professors who filled its chairs, there were always celebrated names. Among the schools of a less elevated rank, those of the Bohemian Brethren at Bunzlau, Prerow, and other places, were distinguished.

Rudolph was a great patron of literature and science; and was quite favourably disposed towards the Bohemian language. Nearly two hundred writers were numbered under his reign; and among these many ladies and gentlemen of his court, of which Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and other scientific foreigners were the chief ornaments. Zeal for the cultivation of their mother tongue, seemed to be the point in which all religious denominations in Bohemia united. But during this century, as in the preceding one, the language of the country existed only side by side with the Latin, which was still preferred by many, for the sake of a more general reputation. It became the chief object of other eminent men, to make their countrymen acquainted with the classics in a Bohemian dress; and to improve the language by a strict imitation of Latin and Greek forms. Among these a rich and noble citizen of Prague named George Hruby must be first named;²⁵ also Pisecky, d. 1511, who translated Isocrates' Epistle to Demonicus; Nicholas Konač and Ulric of Welensky, the translators of Lucian; Krupsky, of Plutarch; Ginterod, of Xen-

²⁵ His full name was George Hruby Gelensky. This patriotic and active individual translated and published a whole series of valuable books; among which we mention only Petrarch's Letters, Cicero's *Laelius* and *Paradoxa*, several works of Jovian, etc. Nicholas Konač followed in the same path. He translated the Bohemian History of Aeneas Sylvius, two dialogues of Lucian, etc. and wrote, edited, and printed other meritorious and elaborate works.

ophon's *Cyropædia*. Kocyn, celebrated for his eloquence and other gifts, translated the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius and Cassiodorus; Orlicny, the Jewish wars of Josephus, several of the Latin classics, etc.

When we consider this general zeal for the cultivation of the language, it is a matter of surprise that the first Bohemian grammar should not be older than A. D. 1533. Its author was Beneš Optat, who also translated Erasmus' paraphrase of the New Testament. Another grammar was published by Benešowsky in 1577, a third by the Slovak Benedicti in 1603. But the individual to whom is justly assigned the chief merit in regard to the language, is Weleslawin, d. 1599, professor of history in the university of Prague, and the proprietor of the greatest printing establishment in Bohemia. Partly by his own works, original and translated, and among these three dictionaries for different purposes; partly by the encouragement he gave to other writers, and the activity with which he caused works whether old or new deserving of a greater circulation, to be printed; he acquired a most powerful influence among his contemporaries.

The field however which was cultivated with the most diligence, was that of theology; and fortunately, during this whole period, with an equal measure of talent and zeal. The writings of the Bohemian brethren, Thomas Prelavsky, Laurentius Krasonitzky, and more especially of Lucas, belong partly to the former, partly to the present period. The latter was a most productive writer; and as being one of their best scholars, he was generally chosen to answer the charges made against the United Brethren, in learned and elaborate pamphlets.²⁶ Several of the productions of the Brethren, mentioned in the former period, were written and printed in the beginning of this. Among these in 1508, Procopius' question, "Whether it is right for a Christian to compel infidels or heretics to embrace the true faith?" is remarkable, as one of the earliest instances in which this position of intolerance was made the subject of public debate, or at least answered in the negative. In 1563 the New Testament was first translated directly

²⁶ This venerable man was ten years president or bishop (Zprawce) of the United Brethren; and his whole life appears to have been devoted to religious purposes. He prepared the hymn book in use among all the congregations of the Brethren; wrote an interpretation of the Apocalypse, 1501; of the Psalms, 1505; a treatise on Hope, 1503; on Oaths etc. His writings, most of which are replete with erudition, are enumerated in Dobrovsky's *Gesch. der böhm. Sprache*, pp. 238, 239, 372, 378, 379.

from the Greek, by J. Blahoslav, another president of the Bohemian Brethren, a man of profound erudition. The first translation of the whole Bible from the original languages, did not take place until several years later. The first edition of this splendid work, for which the patriotic and pious baron John of Žerotín expressly founded a printing office in his castle of Kralic in Moravia, and advanced money for all the necessary expenses, was printed in 1579. This version is still considered, in respect to language, as a model; and in respect to typography, as unsurpassed. On the fidelity of the translation and the value of the commentary, Schaffarik remarks, that "they contain a great deal of that which, two hundred years later, the learned *coryphaei* of exegesis in our day have exhibited to the world as their own profound discoveries." The translators were Albert Nicolai, Lucas Helic, Joh. Aeneas, George Stryc, E. Coepolla, J. Ephraim, P. Jesenius, and J. Capito.—G. Stryc wrote also a good translation of the Psalms in rhyme, and several theological works. J. Wartowsky likewise translated the Old Testament from the Hebrew and left it in manuscript; but his version has never been published. Of his translation of Erasmus' paraphrase of the gospels, only that of the gospel of Matthew has been printed. Among the Bohemian Brethren, Augusta surnamed Pileator, d. 1572, Strazensky, the above mentioned Blahoslav, Zamrsky, d. 1592, were distinguished by profound erudition. They and many others wrote voluminous works on theological subjects, e. g. biblical researches, systematic divinity, sermons, etc. Several of these writers and also many others, were authors of numerous religious hymns; among which not a few are still considered as unsurpassed in any language. Nicholas Klaudian, who was at the same time physician, printer, and theologian, wrote an apology in favour of the Brethren. This individual, who, besides being the printer and editor of several medical works written by himself and others, was in part the translator of Seneca and Lactantius, has further the merit of having published in 1518 the first map of Bohemia. Luther's sermons and other writings were translated into Bohemian; and the religious affairs of Germany began to excite an intense interest among all classes.

The theological productions of this period written by catholics—among which we distinguish the names Pišek surnamed Scribonius, Makawsky, and the Jesuits Sturm and Hostowin—are mostly of a polemical character; while some also are translations of the fathers, especially of Augustine's writings; or orig-

inal ascetic productions in the form of allegorical novels. Among the Utraquists several individuals were celebrated as preachers; above all Ctibor Kotwa, who was called the Bohemian Cicero, and Dicastus Mirkowsky. Others wrote theological treatises and interpretations of portions of the Scriptures. Such were Beransky, author of an interpretation of Daniel, of the gospels, the epistles, etc. Orličný, or as he is called in Latin, Aquilinas, known chiefly as a translator of the classics;* Turnowsky, a Slovak by birth; Bydžowsky, Bilegowsky the writer of a Bohemian church history and of a history of the Hussites and Picardites; Rwačowsky, Zeletawsky, Tesak author of many popular religious hymns; Palma, who published towards twenty theological works; Pešina, Maurenin, and Borowsky, who wrote interpretations of the epistles and gospels; Wrbensky author of a biblical Synopsis, a Harmony, etc. Rosacius Susišky, distinguished as a Latin poet; Martin of Drazow, Jacobides Stríbrný, Jakesius Prerowsky,† and others.

There are few among the theological writers of this century,—of whom we have named perhaps the twentieth part,—who have not left at least ten volumes of their own writings; while many have reached twice, and some thrice the number. More than one third of the printed works in this department contain sermons. The eloquence of the pulpit acquired a high degree of cultivation; and besides the two Utraquist preachers mentioned above, many other names were celebrated among them. In respect to erudition, however, the Brethren occupied decidedly the first rank. In religious hymns all sects were equally productive; and there are, as we have mentioned already, not a few among them of a high excellence. To the names of spiritual poets alluded to in the preceding paragraphs, we may here add the following; Sobeslawsky Řešatko, Gryllus, Herstein of Radowesic, Horsky, Mart. Pisecky, Taborsky, Sylvanus, a Slovak by birth and called by way of eminence *Poeta Bohemicus*, Chmelowec, Mart. Philomusa, Karlsberg, Hanuš; and more especially Lomnický, *poeta laureatus*, who is regarded as the first Bohemian poet of the age.

These names comprise also nearly all we have to say of the state of Bohemian poetry in general. Not that some of them did not occasionally desert the sacred muse, and compose spe-

* See page 450 above.

† The five last mentioned were banished in 1621.

cimens of secular poetry; for some of Lomnický's larger and most celebrated works belong to this class, as may be seen by the titles; e. g. 'The arrows of Cupid,' 'The golden Bag,' etc.²⁸ But all that is of real poetical value, is of a religious character; and bears too much the stamp of its age, to be relished at the present day. The secular poets of the time wrote, with a few exceptions, in Latin.

Among the historians of merit we may name the following writers of Bohemian history: Hagek of Libočan, Kuthen, Procopius Lupač, Paprocky a Pole who however wrote some of his works in the Bohemian language, Racownicky, and the above-mentioned Weleslawin and Bilegowsky. In respect to universal history, or that of other lands, we find the names of Placel, Sixt von Ottersdorf, Konstantinovic, Kocin, and others. This period is equally rich in valuable books of travels. Count Wratislaw of Mitrowic, d. 1635, described his interesting embassy from Vienna to Constantinople; C. Harant, a courtier and statesman, published his travels in Egypt and Palestine; Prefat of Wilkanow likewise gave a description of his journey from Prague to Palestine; Charles of Žerotín, the son of the munificent patron of the United Brethren, and like him their protector and friend, left letters and a description of his travels.

As lawyers, orators, and political writers, the following names may be adduced: Baron Kocin of Kocinet, whom we have had occasion to mention repeatedly; the counts Sternberg, Wratislaw of Mitrowic, and Slawata; the latter known as one of the persons thrown from a lofty window of the castle by the violence of count Thurn—one of the introductory scenes of the thirty years' war; Baron Budowec of Budow, equally excellent as a Christian and a statesman, the protector and public defender of the Bohemian Brethren, and faithful to his religious conviction until his last breath; Christopher Harant, another nobleman of great merit, whom we mentioned above as a distinguished traveller. Both these last were executed in 1621. Writers of merit in the department of jurisprudence, were also the counsellors Ulric of Prostibor under Ferdinand I, Wolf of Wresowic,

²⁸ Simon Lomnický of Budec was court poet; and in addition to the poetical crown, his talents procured him a patent of nobility. He wrote twenty-eight volumes, most of which are printed. For more general information respecting his works, and those of the other writers here mentioned, we must refer our readers to Jungmann's *Historie literatury České*, Prague, 1825, and Schaffarik's often cited work.

the chancellor Koldin, and others. But on topics like these, by far the greater number wrote only in Latin; and these of course we do not mention here.

Writers on the medical and natural sciences cannot well be separated here; since in most cases the same individuals distinguished themselves in the departments of medicine, astronomy and mathematics. The following, along with many others, are named with distinction: Th. Hagek, body physician of the emperors Maximilian and Rudolph, and a celebrated astronomer; Želotyn, author of medical and mathematical works; Zaluzansky, physician and naturalist, who anticipated the great Linnæus in his doctrine of the sexual distinction and impregnation of plants; P. Codicillus, historian, philosopher, theologian and astronomer, who wrote on all these different subjects; Huber von Riesenbach, a physician and rector of the university of Prague; Šud, a celebrated astronomer; and many more.²⁰

The number of books printed during this period cannot well be ascertained; since by far the greater number were burned or otherwise destroyed in the dreadful catastrophe which signalized its close. Prague alone had eighteen printing offices; and fourteen more existed in other places in Bohemia and Moravia. Besides these, many Bohemian books were printed at Venice, Nürnberg, Wittenberg, etc. and some in Holland and Poland.

In 1617, the emperor Matthias succeeded in obtaining the crown of Bohemia for his nephew Ferdinand, archduke of Austria. This was the signal for the catholics, in spite of the *Litteræ Imperatoriae* of the emperor Rudolph, to make new attempts for the suppression of the protestants. The Estates belonging to this denomination brought their complaint before the emperor, who gave them no redress; and thus the spark was kindled into flames, which for thirty years continued to rage throughout all Germany. At the death of Matthias in 1619, the Bohemians refused to receive Ferdinand II as their king, and elected the protestant palatine Frederic V, a generous prince, but incapable of affording them support. The battle at the White Mountain near Prague, in 1620, decided the destiny of Bohemia. Twenty-seven of the leaders of the insurrection were publicly executed; sixteen were exiled or condemned to prison for life; their property, as also the possessions of seven hundred and twenty-eight noblemen and knights who had voluntarily acknow-

²⁰ See the two works named in the preceding note.

ledged themselves to have taken part in the insurrection, and of twenty-nine others who had fled, was wholly confiscated; and thus the amount of fifty-three millions of rix dollars transferred from protestant to catholic hands. The *Literas Imperatoriae* were annulled; the protestant religion in Bohemia abolished; and that kingdom declared a purely catholic hereditary monarchy. All non-catholic preachers were banished; thirty thousand families who preferred exile to a change of their religion, emigrated. Among them 185 were noble families; the others artists, mechanics, merchants, and labourers. Yet in the villages, among the woods and mountains, where neither soldier nor Jesuit had penetrated, and there alone, many protestants remained, buried in a fortunate obscurity. From the time of this catastrophe, the Bohemian language has never again been used in public business. The thirty years' war completed the devastation of this unfortunate country. In 1617, Bohemia had 732 cities and 34,700 villages; when Ferdinand II died in 1637, there remained 130 cities and 6000 villages; and its three millions of inhabitants were reduced to 780,000.

FOURTH PERIOD.

From the battle at the White Mountain, A. D. 1620, to the Revival of Literature in
A. D. 1774—80.

Of this melancholy period we have but little to say. A dull pressure lay upon the nation; it was as if the heavy strokes inflicted on them had paralysed their very limbs. Innumerable monks came to Bohemia from Italy, Spain, and the south of Germany, who condemned and sacrificed to the flames every Bohemian book as necessarily heretical. There were individuals who boasted having burned with their own hands 60,000 literary works. They broke into private families, and took away whatever Bohemian books they could find. Those which they did not burn, were deposited in separate chambers in the convents, provided with iron grates, bolts, and chains drawn before the door, on which was written, *The Hell*. They distributed pamphlets respecting hell and purgatory, the reading of which produced derangement of mind in many weak persons; until at last the government was wise enough to lay a severe prohibition upon these measures. The Bohemian emigrants indeed continued to have their religious books printed in their foreign homes; but they wrote comparatively few new works. These however they con-

trived to introduce into Bohemia, where they were answered by the Jesuits and Capuchins in thick folio volumes, written in a language hardly intelligible. There were however some honourable exceptions among these fathers; some persons, who independent of religious prejudices continued to labour for the benefit of a beloved mother tongue. The Jesuits Konstanz, Steyer, and Drachovsky, wrote grammatical works, and the two first attempted to translate the Bible anew. Plachy, d. 1650, Libertin, and Taborsky, were distinguished preachers; Pešina, d. 1680, Hammerschmidt, d. 1731, and Beckowsky, d. 1725, wrote meritorious historical works; Rosa, d. 1689, composed another grammar and a dictionary. Others wrote in Latin; and among these must be named the Jesuit Balbin, d. 1688, who prepared several historical and bibliographical works of importance, part of which however were not published until long after his death.³⁰

We turn once more to the unfortunate emigrants, and in the midst of the distress, privations, and sacrifices, which were the natural accompaniments of their exiled condition, we rejoice to meet with a name, which owes its splendour not alone to the general poverty of the period, but which outshines even the most distinguished of the former age, and is indeed the only one in the literary history of Bohemia, which has acquired an *European* fame. This is Comenius, the last bishop of the Bohemian Brethren. Although he belongs partly to the former period, and, in respect to his style, decidedly to the golden age of the Bohemian literature, the time of his principal activity falls within this melancholy period. A few words may be devoted to the life of this remarkable individual. He was born A. D. 1592 in the village of Komna in Moravia. His baptismal names were John Amos; his father had probably no family name, as was frequently the case at that time among the lower classes throughout all Europe. According to the custom of the time, he was called Komnensky from his native place, the Latin form of which is Comnenius, or more commonly Comenius.

³⁰ Balbin was professor of rhetoric at Prague. His works are of importance for the literary history of Bohemia: *Epitome rer. Bohem.* Prague 1677. *Miscellanea hist. rer. Bohem.* Prague 1680—88. After his death Unger edited in 1777—80 his *Bohemia docta*, and Pelzel in 1775 his *Dissertatio apologetica pro lingua Slavonica, praecipue Bohemica*. See below under the fifth period of Bohemian literature, near the beginning.

His parents, who belonged to the community of the Brethren, sent him to school at Herborn. He distinguished himself so much as to be made rector at Prerau, when only twenty-two years old; and two years later was transferred to Fulnek. In 1618 this latter city was plundered by the Spaniards, and Comenius lost all his books and other property. When the great persecution of the protestants broke out, he fled to Poland. Here he found many of his countrymen, of the sect of the Brethren, whom the persecutions of the former century had already driven hither, and who had here gathered themselves into communities essentially of the same constitution; although in some measure they were amalgamated with the dissenters in Poland. In 1632 they elected him their bishop. In 1631 he published his *Janua linguarum reserata*, a work which spread his fame over all the world, and which was translated into twelve European languages, and also into Persian, Arabian, and Mongolian. His object in this work was to point out a new method of teaching languages, by which they were to be used as keys for acquiring other useful knowledge. In 1641 he was invited to England to prepare a new arrangement of the schools; but the civil war having prevented the execution of this project, he went from England to Sweden, whither the chancellor Oxenstiern had invited him for a similar purpose. After protracted journeys through half Europe, he returned to Lissa, the principal seat of his activity. In 1659 he published his *Orbis pictus*, the first picture book for children which ever appeared, and which acquired the same reputation as the work above mentioned. The war and the destruction of Lissa compelled him some years later to leave Poland; he sought another asylum in Germany, and settled at length at Amsterdam, where he died in 1671, occupied with literary pursuits until his last hour. According to Adelung he wrote not less than ninety-two works, of which only fifty-four have come down to us; and among these twenty are in the Bohemian language. His style has a classical perfection; the contents of his works are manifold, and have mostly lost their interest for the present age.³¹ In the last

³¹ One of Comenius's works: *Labirynt swieta a rag srdce*, i. e. the World's Labyrinth and the Heart's Paradise, reminds us strongly of Bunyan's celebrated Pilgrim's Progress. It was first printed at Prague 1631, in 4to. and after several editions in other places, it was last printed at the same city in 1809, 12mo. His Latin works were printed at Amsterdam in 1657, under the title *Opera didactica*.

years of his life, Comenius is said to have devoted himself to a mystical interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures ; he discovered in the Revelation of St. John the state of Europe, as it then was ; awaited the millennium in the year 1672 ; and believed in the far-famed Bourignon, as in an inspired prophetess.

A few names only among the emigrants require to be mentioned as writers, after Comenius. They may find their place here : Paul Stransky, who was exiled in 1626 and found an asylum as professor at Thorn, wrote a history of Bohemia in Latin in 1643, which was translated and accompanied with supplements and corrections by Cornova, in 1792. Elsner, pastor of the Bohemian Brethren at Berlin, and Kleich at Zittau, printed works for religious instruction, devotional exercises for protestants, etc.

The greater part of what was written during this period, proceeded from the Slovaks in Hungary, a nation related to the Bohemians in race and language, who after the reformation had adopted the Bohemian dialect as their literary language.* Although also constantly struggling against oppression and persecution, the protestants in Hungary were not formally annihilated, as in Bohemia ; but belonged rather to the so called tolerated sects. A certain degree of activity in behalf of their brethren in faith, was consequently allowed to them, especially under Maria Theresa. We meet among them with hardly any other than theological productions, or works for religious edification. The two pastors Krman and Bel, who both died towards the middle of the eighteenth century, men of no inconsiderable merit as Christians and as scholars, prepared a new edition of the Bohemian Bible, translated several works of Luther, Arndt, etc. Ambrosius, their cotemporary, wrote a commentary on Luther's catechism, and several other useful religious works ; G. Bahyl published an introduction to the Bible, a history of the symbolical books, and assisted Comenius in his *Orbis pictus* ; Matthias Bahyl became the object of a cruel persecution, on account of a translation of Meissner's *Consultatio orthod. de fide Lutherana*, etc. Numerous religious hymns were written in Bohemian by Hruškowic, the two Blasius, Glosius, Augustini, and others. Michalides translated the *Summarium biblicum* of the theologians of Wittenberg ; and another protestant minister, Doležal, wrote in 1746 a Bohemian grammar. But their books, with a

* See p. 423 above.

few exceptions, were little read beyond the frontiers of Hungary, and had consequently little or no influence on the Bohemians. The works written in the Slovakian dialect do not belong here.

FIFTH PERIOD.

Revival of Bohemian Literature, from A. D. 1774—80 to the present time.

In A. D. 1774, the marshal count Kinsky published a work on the advantages and necessity of a knowledge of the Bohemian language. At that time so great was the neglect of the mother tongue, that even for a work of so patriotic a nature, he had to employ a foreign language in order to be understood ! One year later appeared an apology for the vernacular tongue of the country, written by the Jesuit Balbin, and edited by Pelzel. These two writings created a deep sensation ; and even the government would seem to have taken notice of them. We find, at least, that in the same year, teachers of the Bohemian language were appointed in the university of Vienna and in two other institutions in that city. At the same time, the royal normal school at Prague began to print several Bohemian books for instruction. When the tolerant views and principles by which Joseph II was actuated, became known, more than a hundred thousand concealed protestants immediately appeared ; their hidden books were brought to light again ; and many works of which only single copies existed, were reprinted. In 1781 the severe edict of Ferdinand II was repealed, and a censorship established upon more reasonable principles. In 1786, the Bohemian language had gained friends enough to induce the government to institute a Bohemian theatre ; which, with a short interruption during the present century, has ever since existed. The Bohemian language has enjoyed still more encouragement during the reign of the present emperor of Austria. In 1793 a professorship for the language and literature of the country was founded in the university of Prague ; the use of that language in all the schools was ordained by several decrees of the government ; and by a law of A. D. 1818, a knowledge of it is made a necessary qualification for holding any office.

In the very outset of this revival of Bohemian literature there appeared so great a multitude of writers, such habits of diligence and productiveness were immediately manifested throughout the whole nation, and such a mass of respectable talent was brought

to light, that the long interval of a dull and deathlike silence, which preceded this period, presents indeed an enigma difficult to be solved. No small influence may be ascribed to Germany. The principles of the government were changed ; the country, physically as well as morally exhausted, could recover but gradually ; but all this could not create talents where there were none ; nor could all external oppression and unfavourable conjunctures destroy the germs of real talent, if they had been there. The list of modern Bohemian writers of merit is very extensive ; but we must be satisfied with bringing forward the most distinguished of them, and refer the reader to works less limited than these pages, where he may find more complete information.

Among those whose desert is the greatest in respect to the revival of Bohemian literature, Kramerius, b. 1753, d. 1808, must be named first. He was one of those indefatigable and creative minds, which never sleep, never lose a moment, and by a restless activity and happy ingenuity know how to render the difficult easy,—the apparently impossible, practicable. From the year 1785, he was editor of the first Bohemian newspaper ; from 1788, of the annual called the *Toleranz Kalender*, or Almanac of Toleration ; and published besides this more than fifty works, written by himself and others, but accompanied with notes or commentaries of his own. None of his productions surpassed mediocrity ; but according to the best judges, they were well and perspicuously written ; they became popular and exerted a very favourable influence.

As literary historians, Slavic philologists and antiquaries, Pelzel, Prochazka, Durich, Puchmayer, Negedly, Jungmann, Tomsa, Hanka, and above all Dobrovsky, must be distinguished. One of the principal merits of most of these scholars consists in their preparing for print and editing valuable old manuscripts ; or in the judicious commentaries which they added to new editions of ancient works already printed. Pelzel we have named above as the editor of the writings of the Jesuit Balbin. Most of his works are in German, but some also in Bohemian. In 1804 Prochazka and Durich translated the Bible for catholics ; the former had already translated the New Testament in 1786. His principal labours besides this, were in the department of history. Durich wrote in Latin ; but his researches were nevertheless devoted to the Bohemian language and history. Tomsa and Negedly have written Bohemian grammars, and

several other Slavic-philological works and essays.³² Puchmay-er published a large collection of poetry,³³ consisting partly of his own productions, a token of the reviving poetical genius of the nation, which had slept for centuries; his elaborate Russian grammar is also a valuable contribution to Slavic literature in general. Joseph Jungmann, besides a translation of Chateaubriand's *Atala* and of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which Bowring calls "the most admirable among the many admirable versions of that renowned and glorious heroic,"* has written many important essays scattered in periodicals; and also published in 1820 a *Bohemian chrestomathy*, in 1825 a history of Bohemian literature, and in 1830—31 a complete dictionary of that language. Hanka, librarian at Prague, has made himself particularly known by critical editions of valuable writings out of the golden age of Bohemian literature. In 1817 he was so fortunate as to discover a manuscript of high importance, as well in a philological respect, as for its intrinsic poetical value; which he published in 1819 with a modern Bohemian translation, and also a German translation by Swoboda.³⁴ He has written several works, and also essays in periodicals, of a bibliographical and antiquarian character. Joseph Dobrovsky, born in 1753 in Hungary, but of Bohemian parents, d. 1829, is called the patriarch of the Slavic literature, and was one of the profoundest scholars of the age. His merits in regard to Slavic philology and history are so generally acknowledged, and we have so often had occasion to cite his name in these pages, and to refer the reader to his authority, that without attempting to present a critical view of one, or an analysis of another of his works, we are contented to give in a note the title of his principal works. We are the more willing to adopt this course, because the most of his works form in a certain measure one great whole and mutually supply each other; and because too, the author having in part first explored unknown regions, and having of course

³² J. Ngedly translated the *Iliad*, and also Young's *Night Thoughts* under the name of *Kvileni*, Lamentations. He and his brother Adalbert are also favourably known as lyric poets.

³³ In the year 1795; the fifth and last volume appeared in 1804. Bowring has given several specimens of this collection in the *For. Quart. Review*, Vol. II. p. 145.

* *For. Quart. Review*, Vol. II. p. 167.

³⁴ The celebrated manuscript of *Königinhof*; see note 8.

sometimes found it necessary to retract hypotheses started in his earlier writings, his works cannot well be separated. He wrote mostly in German; sometimes in Latin; while comparatively very few of his numerous books are in the Bohemian language. In this way only could they gain that kind of universality which the subject required, and which has so much contributed to promote the cause of Slavic literature in general.³⁵

There were also some scholars among the Slovaks, who aided the same cause with diligence and talent. Leska, d. 1818, published from 1785 onward the first Slovakian newspaper, and was a diligent and judicious compiler in respect to Slavic lexicography. Palkowicz published a Bohemian dictionary, and prepared in 1808 a more correct edition of the Bible. Plachy, besides many volumes of prose and poetry, published a valuable periodical; Schramko wrote some philological works, etc.

After the collection of poetry by Puchmayer above alluded to, several others of a miscellaneous kind appeared; poetry having been hitherto limited almost exclusively to religious purposes. Kamaryt, Palacky, Chmelensky, Zdirad Polak, Čelakowsky, Snajdr, Hnewkowsky, Turinsky, Šir, are favourably known as poets. A. Marek has translated several dramas of Shakspeare; Machaček, several from Goethe; Kličpera, Stepanek, and Sychra, are esteemed dramatic writers. Among the Slovaks, Holli translated the Latin and Greek elegiac poets; Rošnay, Anacreon; and Kollar, who imitates Petrarch, and personifies Slavonia his country as his Laura, manifests a poetical talent of the very first order.³⁶ The most interesting work however for the friends of poetry, is a collection of popular

³⁵ Dobrovsky's principal works are the following: *Script. rer. Bohem.* (with Pelzel) Prague 1784. *Böhm. and Mähr. Literatur*, Prague 1779—84. *Lit. Magazin für Böhmen und Mähren*, 1786—87. *Lit. Nachrichten von einer Reise nach Schweden und Russland*, Prague 1796. *Geschichte der böhm. Sprache und Lit.* Prague 1792; new edition much altered, ib. 1818. *Slavin*, Prague 1808. *Slovanka*, Prague 1814—15. *Lehrgebäude der böhm. Sprache*, Prague 1809, 1819. *Etymologicon*, Prague 1813. *Deutsch-böhm. Wörterb.* 1802—21. *Institutiones Linguae Slav.* Vienna 1822. *Cyrill und Method*, Prague 1823. Also a large number of smaller treatises, essays, reviews, etc. either printed separately, or in periodicals.

³⁶ For several beautiful specimens of this poet, see Bowring's *Essay on Bohemian literature*, in the *For. Quart. Review*, Vol. II.

songs, by Čelakowsky, which contains a very judicious selection of that inimitable species of songs gathered not only from the Bohemians, Moravians, and Slovaks themselves, but also translations from most of the other Slavic dialects. The reader may himself imagine, how rich in songs so musical a people must be.³⁷

In the department of natural science are to be mentioned, Prest, count Berchtold, Strnad, Sedláček, Wydra, etc. Others, Bohemians by birth, have written in German, e. g. Haenke, Sieber, etc. etc. Count Buquoy also is of Bohemian origin.—Writers of merit on moral and religious subjects are, Rautenkranz, Zahradník, Parizek and others. The Slovak Bartholomæides, a distinguished scholar, has written several useful works on various topics.—Periodicals full of learned researches and variety of interest were edited, *Dobroslaw* by Hromádka and Ziegler, *Krok* by Pest, etc. Among the highest nobility the national language found powerful patrons, and in the establishment of a national Museum, a Bohemian Academy of Sciences, and similar patriotic institutions, the national literature received great encouragement. The names of the counts K. Sternberg and Kolowrat-Liebsteinsky must be mentioned here. But the state of the country is nevertheless far from what it ought to be. The sovereignty of the German language is probably established forever. The present literature of Bohemia, is as Jungmann expresses it, “the produce of a few enthusiasts, who, exposing themselves to the hatred of their enemies and the ingratitude of their countrymen, have devoted themselves to the resuscitation of a language, which is neither living nor dead.” It is justly to be feared that their strength will not hold out to struggle against the torrent of time, which in its resistless course overwhelms the nations, and only throws their vestiges in scattered fragments on the banks, as feeble memorials to shew to an inquiring posterity that they once existed.³⁸

³⁷ The title of this work is *Slovanske narodni pisne*, Prague 1822, 1827. A similar collection is *Česke narodni pisne*, by Ritter von Rittersberg, Prague 1825. Bowring gives some interesting specimens from the former. For. Quart. Rev. Vol. II.

³⁸ For more complete information in respect to Bohemian literature, a knowledge of one of the Slavic idioms or of the German language is absolutely required; we know of nothing written on this subject in the English language, except the article of Bowring so often cited, which gives an able survey of the poetical part of the literature,

II. Language and Literature of the Slovaks.

The northwestern part of Hungary is inhabited by the Slovaks, a Slavic nation, who appear to be the direct descendants of the original Slavic settlers in Europe. Numerous colonists of the

but does not profess to cover the whole ground. Besides the numerous works of Dobrovsky, we would refer our readers to the following books: *Effigies virorum eruditorum Bohem. et Morav. etc.* by Voigt and Braun, in German by Pelzel, Prague, 1773—82. Balbini *Bohemia docta*, see note 30. Prochazka *de Secularibus liberal. art. in Bohem. et Morav.* 1782. Also his *Miscellaneen der böhm. und mähr. Lit.* Prague 1784—5. Rulika *Učena Čechic*, Prague 1807—8. Nowotneho *Lužc Bibliotheca českých Bibli.* Prague 1810—18. Jungmann's *Historie literatury česke*, Prague 1825. Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Slavischen Sprache und Literatur*. The grammatical and lexical part of the Bohemian literature is uncommonly rich, and exhibits no small mass of talent. We confine ourselves to citing the titles of those written in German or Latin. No helps in English or French for learning the Bohemian language, so far as we know, ever existed.—GRAMMARS. *Kurze Unterweisung beyder Sprachen, teutsch und böhmisch*, Pilsen 1531 and several later editions. Klatowsky *Böhmisch-deutsche Gespräche*, Prague 1540, and several later editions. B. Optat *Anleitung zur böhm. Orthogr.* etc. 1533, Prague 1588 and 1643. Benešowsky *Gram. Bohem.* Prague 1577. Benedict a Nudožer *Gram. Bohem.* Prague 1603. Drachowsky *Gramm. Bohem.* Olmütz 1660. Constantin's *Lima linguae Bohem.* Prague 1667. *Principia linguae Bohem.* 1670—80; new edition 1783. Jandit *Gramm. ling. Bohem.* Prague 1704, seven new editions to 1753. Dolezal *Gramm. Slavico-bohem.* Pressburg 1746. Pohl *Böhmische Sprachkunst*, Vienna 1756, five editions to 1783. Tham *Böhm. Sprachlehre*, Prague 1785; also his *Böhm. Grammatik*, 1798—1804. Pelzel *Grundsätze der böhm. Sprache*, Prague 1797—98. Negedly *Böhm. Grammatik*, Prague 1804, fourth edition 1830. Dobrovsky's *Lehrgebäude der böhm. Sprache*, Prague 1809, second edition 1819.—DICTIONARIES. Of these we mention only such as would aid persons who wish to learn the language so far as to read Bohemian books; referring the reader for an enumeration of the others to Schaffarik, p. 301. Weleslawin *Sylva quadrilinguis*, Prague 1598. *Gazophylacium bohém. lat. graec. germ.* Prague 1671. Rohn *Böhmisch-lat. deutscher Nomenclator*, Prague 1764—68. Tham *Böhmisch-deutsches Nationallexicon*, Prague 1805—7. Also his *Deutsch-böhmisches und Böhmisch-deutsches Taschenwörterbuch*, Prague 1818. Tomsa *Böhm. deutsch-lat. Wörterbuch*, Prague 1791. Palkowicz *Böhmisch-deutsch-lateinisches Wörterbuch*, Pressburg 1821.

same race are scattered all over the other parts of that country. The Byzantine historians, and, somewhat later, the Russian annalist Nestor, speak of the region on the north of the Danube as being the primitive seat of the Slavi. In early times the *Sarmatae limigantes* or *Jazyges metanastae*, nomadic tribes between the Danube and the Theiss, whose name indicates incontestably their having been Slavi,³⁹ are mentioned as having troubled the Byzantine empire. But they soon disappear entirely from history, and it is not before the ninth century, when they were already Christians, that we meet them again. At that time Slovakia, in Slavic *Slovansko*, viz. the regions adjacent to the two rivers Waag and Gran, reappears as an ingredient part of the ephemeral kingdom of Great Moravia. The rest of Pannonia was inhabited by other Slavic tribes, by Bulgarians, Rumelians and Khazars. In A. D. 894, the Madjares conquered Pannonia, drove back the Slovaks into the mountains, and made them tributary; whilst they themselves settled on the plains. But although the Slovaks appear to have submitted to their fate, and to have thenceforth lived on good terms with their conquerors, it cannot unconditionally be said that the two nations were merged in each other; since, even after nearly a thousand years have passed, they still speak different languages. The Madjares learned the arts of peace from the Slavi; who, besides being already Christians, had built many cities, and were mechanics, traders, agriculturists. All words and terms relating to these occupations, the Madjares had to obtain from them. The Slovaks on their side lost their national existence in that of their Asiatic conquerors, entered into their ranks as soldiers, and participated thenceforward in all their fortunes; but the influence of the Madjares on their language could be only inconsiderable, since the circle of new ideas which the Slovaks had to receive in exchange from them, barbarians as they were, could be only very limited. The language however is the only remnant of their national existence, which the Slovaks have preserved; in every other respect they belong to the Hungarian nation, of which they form an ingredient part, as the Madjares form another; and on the glory of whose valiant deeds they have an equal claim.

Hungary, traversed by two large rivers, the Danube and the Theiss, is divided into four great circles, usually called this side

³⁹ See Schlözer's edition of Nestor, Vol II. p. 76, 97. *Jazyk* signifies in Slavic, *lingua*, tongue.

the Danube and beyond the Danube, this side the Theiss and beyond the Theiss. The circle this side the Theiss is the principal seat of the Slovaks. The counties Trencaín, Thuróc, Arva, Liptau, and Sohl, are entirely inhabited by them, amounting to about 550,000 in number. In the other counties of the same circle they live more mingled with Russniaks and Madjares; and together with the numerous Slovakish settlements which are scattered over all Hungary, are computed in all at about 1,800,000. About 1,300,000 of them are catholics, and the remaining 500,000 protestants.

The Slovakish language, exposed through the geographical situation of the nation, to the influence of various other Slavic idioms—as the Polish, Bohemian, Malo-Russian, Servian, and Vindish—is more broken up into different dialects than perhaps any living tongue. In its original elements it is very nearly related to the Old Slavic language;⁴⁰ a fact which is easy to be explained, when we consider that the developement of this language must have been the result of the primitive cultivation of the Slavi; and that the region about the Carpathian mountains, the seat of the ancient as well as of the present Slovaks, was the cradle of all the Slavic nations which are now spread over the whole of eastern Europe. Of all living Slavic tongues, the Bohemian is the nearest related to the Slovakish, especially as it appears in the oldest Bohemian writers; a circumstance which induced Dobrovsky at first to consider both languages as essentially the same; or rather to maintain, that the Slovakish was nothing more than Old Bohemian. But after entering more deeply into the subject, he found reason to regard the Slovakish idiom as a separate dialect, which forms the link of connexion between the Bohemian and Croatian-Vindish dialects, or between the two principal divisions, the Eastern and Western stems, of the great Slavic family.*

To enumerate the features by which the Slovakish dialects are distinguished from the other Slavic languages, would oblige

⁴⁰ We have seen in the History of the Old Slavic language, that on account of the great similarity between the old Slavic and the Slovakish dialects, both in respect to form and grammatical structure and in the meaning of words, it has been maintained by several philologists, that the language of Cyril's translation of the Bible was in the translator's time the Moravian *Slovakian* dialect. See p. 346 above.

* See p. 413 above.

us to enter more into detail than would be acceptable to persons not acquainted with any of them ; as we may suppose to be the case with most of our readers. Besides, most of the peculiarities which could be alleged as *general* characteristics, are contradicted by so many single cases, that all general rules would be in danger of being rendered void by a plurality of exceptions. The only thing which the Slovaks have not in common with any of the other Slavic tongues, is a variety of diphthongs where all the rest have simple vowels ; e. g. *kuoň*, horse, for *koň* ; *lieuč*, light, for *luč*, etc. In the counties situated on the frontiers of Galicia, the Slovakish language participates in many of the peculiarities of the Polish tongue ; on the frontier of Moravia, the dialect of the people approaches nearer to the vernacular idiom of that province, and consequently to the Bohemian, which has been adopted as their own literary language. On the Slovaks who live more in the interior of the country, the influence of the Madjares, or of the Transylvanian-Germans, or of the Russniaks, or of the Servians, is more or less prominent, according to their location. The less exposed to the influence of other races, the purer of course has the proper Slovakian idiom been preserved. But even in its purest state, it has, as we mentioned above, a strong and decided resemblance to the Bohemian tongue ; from which it is however distinguished by a more harmonious and pleasing sound ; its vowels being fuller and occurring more frequently. But a peculiarity which distinguishes it more materially, is a treasure of words and phrases obsolete or entirely unknown in the present Bohemian language ; although they were to be found in the old Bohemian, and are so still, in part, in the Old Slavic, Russian, and Vindish dialects. Schaffarik mentions that G. Rybay, a minister in the county of Bač, who possessed many valuable manuscripts, had collected 15,000 words for a Slovakish *Idioticon*, and that it would be easy to enlarge this number.⁴¹

The Slovakish language has never been a literary language ; the first attempt to render it so, with a few trifling exceptions, was made about forty years ago ; but the opposition which it met with from the literati who had already adopted the kindred Bohemian tongue for their literary language, together with the

⁴¹ *Geschichte der slavischen Sprache*, etc. p. 377. G. Palcovič, who bought this manuscript, has inserted a large number of Slovakish provincialisms in his Bohemian dictionary.

political obstacles which it had to encounter from the jealousy of the Madjares, seems to have been too strong to be conquered. Indeed, in consequence of this jealousy of the Madjares, the Slovakish language is so far oppressed, that even in the higher schools of the Slovaks themselves this language is not permitted to constitute a branch of instruction, like the Hungarian and Latin. Schaffarik thinks it probable, that in ancient times the vernacular tongue of the counties inhabited by Slovaks was used in public documents and similar writings; and that such historical monuments must be buried in the libraries and archives of the catholic archbishops, noblemen, and cities.⁴² But this subject has never been sufficiently examined. Even the historical popular songs, which about fifty years ago were still to be heard among the Slovakian peasants, and some of which appear to have been derived even from the pagan period, have perished, with the exception of a few initial verses.⁴³ There is no trace known to be left of the mental existence of this nation of nearly two millions of souls, until the middle of the fifteenth century. At that time a great body of Hussites, who were exiled from Bohemia, broke into Upper Hungary, and under the conduct of Giskra von Brandeis, were hired by the queen Elizabeth against the rival Polish-Hungarian monarch Vladislaus, afterwards king of Bohemia. The Bohemian soldiers were accompanied by their wives and children, and settled finally in different parts of Hungary. Other Taboritic colonists followed them, and amalgamated gradually with the Slovaks, among whom they principally established themselves. It is probable that at this time the Slovaks became familiar with the Bohemian as a literary language, which from its kindred genius and its similarity of forms was perfectly intelligible, and must have been highly acceptable to them. When the doctrines of the German reformers penetrated into Hungary, they found the Slovaks already so well prepared, that those doctrines were at once spread among the people by numerous books written by Slovakian clergymen in the Bohemian language. The Bible and the li-

⁴² See the same work, p. 381.

⁴³ More modern Slovakish popular songs are to be found in Čelakowsky's collection, see above, p. 462 sq. and in the work: *Pieseňové básne slovenského w Uhřích*, Pesth 1823. The collection: *Slavische Volkslieder*, by Wenzig, Halle 1830, contains sixteen Slovakish songs, mostly taken from Čelokowsky's work in a German translation.

urgical books were written and printed in Bohemian ; and many Bohemians and Moravians came into Hungary as preachers and teachers. Thus the dominion of the Bohemian language over the pulpit, and, since *all* the Slovakian writers of this period were clergymen, in the republic of letters also, was established among the Slovaks without struggle. There is nothing known of any catholic Slovakish writers at this period ; if there were any, they probably followed the beaten track and wrote also in Bohemian or in Latin. But the produce of the literary cultivation of the Slovaks during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is at most but small ; for the times appear to have been too heavy, and men's minds too much oppressed, for a free development of their powers. The civil wars, the devastations of the Turks, the religious controversies, and after the battle at the White Mountain, religious oppression and persecution, chased the peaceful muses from Pannonia and put the genius of the people in chains. All the productions of these two centuries, with a few exceptions, are confined to theology, and are mostly sermons, catechisms, devotional exercises, or religious hymns. Schaffarik observes that from these latter there speaks a melancholy gloomy spirit, crying for divine aid and deliverance.⁴⁴ Those Slovakian writers who in any measure distinguished themselves, have been enumerated under their proper heads in our sketch of the Bohemian literature.*

The Bohemian dialect, as we have mentioned repeatedly, is perfectly *intelligible* to the Slovaks. But as it is not to them the language of common conversation, it cannot be *familiar* to their minds. If, in listening to their preachers in the churches, the people succeed in straining up their minds sufficiently to enable them to follow the course of the sermons and devotional exercises, it still seems rather unnatural that even their prayer books, destined for private use, should not be written in their vernacular tongue ; but that even their addresses to the Most High, which more than anything else should be the free and natural effusions of their inmost feelings, should require such an intellectual exertion and an artificial transposition into a foreign clime. It is a singular fact, that whilst everywhere else protestantism and the friends of the Bible have advocated and attempted to raise the dialect of the people, in opposition to a privileged idiom of the priesthood, among the Slovaks the vindication of the vernacular

⁴⁴ See *Geschichte der sl. Spr.* p. 383.

* 458, 462.

tongue has been attempted by the catholics, and has met with strong opposition from the protestants. In the year 1718, Alex. Macsay, a catholic clergyman, published sermons at Tyrnau, written in the common Slovakian dialect. The Jesuits of Tyrnau followed his example, in publishing books of prayers and several other religious works, in a language which is rather a mixture of the dialect of the people and the literary Bohemian language. During the last ten years of the eighteenth century, a more successful attempt was made to elevate the Slovakian dialect spoken on the frontiers of Moravia, and which approaches the Bohemian language most, to the rank of a literary language. At the head of this undertaking were the catholic curates Bajza, Fandli, and Bernolak, especially the last. A society was formed, the members of which bound themselves to buy the books written in Slovakish by Bernolak and his friends. The catholics proceeded in the work with great zeal and activity, and were patronized by the cardinal Rudnay, primate of Hungary, who himself published some of his orations held in the Slovakian dialect, and caused a voluminous Slovakish dictionary, a posthumous work of Bernolak's, to be printed.⁴⁵ A version of the Bible in the same dialect, made by the canon G. Palkowicz, who is also the author of the fourth volume of the above dictionary, was printed in the year 1831.

The protestant Slovaks, who several centuries ago had already acquired by their own contributions the right of citizens in the Bohemian republic of letters,—especially during the course of the seventeenth century, when most of the native Bohemians had been banished from it,—feared to endanger the cause of literature itself by innovations of this kind. They too united themselves into a society, and founded a professorship of Bohemian-Slovakian literature at the Lyceum of Pressburg, which was occupied by another G. Palkowicz, honourably mentioned in our History of Bohemian literature.⁴⁶ The number of protes-

⁴⁵ The same individual, who caused the Dalmatian Bible to be printed; see p. 405 above.

⁴⁶ These two individuals of the same baptismal and family names, George Palkowicz, both following the same pursuits and both not without desert in respect to their countrymen, but nevertheless serving opposite interests according to their different views, must not be confounded. Professor Palkowicz prepared a new edition of the Bohemian Bible for the Slovaks; see p. 462 above. Canon Palkowicz trans-

tant Slovaks being comparatively small, this institution was not sustained longer than ten years. The names of the principal Slovakish-Bohemian writers during this and the last century, have been given above.⁴⁷ We add here those of Bartholomaeides, Tablic, Lowich, and Moschotzy, themselves writers of merit, or promoters of literature and science.

Many among the Slovaks, like their brethren the Madjares, have received a German education; and some indeed have advanced far enough to have that language at command. For the sake of more fame or a larger field of influence, they mostly prefer to write in German. Of these we adduce here only the author of the History of the Slavic Language and Literature, so often cited in our pages, Schaffarik, professor at Neusatz; who in choosing the German language as his vehicle, has only followed the example of the two greatest Slavic authorities, Dobrovsky and Kopitar.* His work, however, although in other respects justly considered as a valuable contribution to German literature, has contributed more than all others to a knowledge of the Slavic literature in general, and of the classification and mutual relations of the Slavic languages.⁴⁸

III. History of the Polish Language and Literature.

The regions of the Baltic and Vistula, after the Goths and Vandals had finally left them, were occupied, towards the fourth century, by the Lettonians and Lithuanians, who are according to some historians Slavic, and according to others Finnic-Scythic tribes.⁴⁹ Other parts of the country were inhabited by the An-

lated the Scriptures into the Slovakian dialect. Professor P. published a Bohemian dictionary, see pp. 462, 464. Canon P. the fourth volume of Bernolak's Slovakian lexicon, as said in the text above.

⁴⁷ See p. 458, 462.

* See more in the Appendix.

⁴⁸ There does not yet exist a philological work, from which a complete knowledge of the Slovakian language in its different dialects could be obtained. The following works of Bernolak regard chiefly the Slovakish-Moravian dialect: *Grammatica Slavica*, Posonii 1790, *Dissertatio de literis Slavorum*, Posonii 1783. *Etymologia vocum Slavicarum*, Tyrnau 1791. *Lexicon Slav. Lat. Germ. Hung.* Buda 1825.

⁴⁹ See above, p. 334. On the origin of these tribes, which seem to have been kindred nations with the ancient Livonians, Esthonians, and

tes and Lygians, nations of the Slavic race, who at the general migration of nations turned themselves, the latter towards the west, and the former southwards, where they settled in Walachia. All these tribes and many more were by the ancients comprised under the name of Sarmatae. In the sixth, or according to others, in the seventh century, the Lekhes, a people kindred to the Tchekhes, who were urged forwards by the Bulgarians, settled on the banks of the Vistula and Varta. Lekh (Lech, Ljach) signified in old Bohemian a free and noble man, and had this meaning still in the fourteenth century. The Lekhes were divided into several tribes, of which, according to Nestor, at first only those who settled on the vast plains, *polie*, of the Ukraine, were called *Polyane*, Poles, i. e. inhabitants of the plain. The tribes which occupied Masovia were called *Masowshane*; the Lekhes who went to Pomerania, *Pomoriane*, etc. The specific name of *Poles*, as applied to all the Lekhish tribes together, does not appear until the close of the tenth century, when the generic appellation of Lekhes or Ljaches had perished. In the year 840, the chiefs of the different tribes united themselves under one common head; at that time they are said to have chosen a husbandman by the name of Pjast for their duke, and the male descendants of this, their first prince, lived and reigned not less than six hundred and thirty years. From Germany and Bohemia Christianity was carried to Poland by catholic priests, probably as early as the ninth century. In the beginning of the tenth, some attempts were made to introduce the Slavic liturgy into Poland. Both species of worship existed for some time peacefully side by side; and even when through the exertions of the Latin priesthood, the Slavic liturgy was gradually superseded by the occidental rites, the former was at least tolerated; and after the invention of printing, the Polish city of Cracow was the first place where books in the Old Slavic dialect, and portions of the Old Slavic Bible, were printed.⁵⁰

Borussians, many hypotheses have been started, but the truth has not yet been sufficiently ascertained. It is at least evident that they are not of Slavic origin, although even this has been maintained by many historians, who were misled by local circumstances. See Parrot's *Versuch einer Entwicklung der Sprache, Abstammung, etc. der Liven, Letten*, etc. The Foreign Quarterly Review contains an interesting essay on Lettish popular poetry, Vol. VIII. p. 61.

⁵⁰ See p. 352, 356.

In the year 965, the duke Miesislav married the Bohemian princess Dombrovka, and caused himself to be baptized. From that time onward, all the Polish princes and the greatest part of the nation became Christians. There is however not one among the Slavic nations, in which the influence Christianity must necessarily have exerted on its mental cultivation, is so little visible; while upon its language it exerted none at all. It has ever been and is still a favourite opinion of some Slavic philologists, that several of the Slavic nations must have possessed the art of writing long before their acquaintance with the Latin alphabet, or the invention of the Cyrillic system; and among the arguments by which they maintain this view, there are indeed some too striking to be wholly set aside.⁵¹ But neither from those early times, nor from the four or five centuries after the introduction of Christianity, does there remain any monument whatever of the Polish language; nay, with the exception of a few fragments without value, the most ancient document of that language extant, is not older than the sixteenth century. Until that time the Latin idiom reigned exclusively in Poland. The teachers of Christianity in this country were for nearly five centuries foreigners, viz. Germans and Italians. Hence arose that unnatural neglect of the vernacular tongue, of which these were ignorant; the private influence of the German, still visible in the Polish language; and the unlimited dominion of the Latin. Slavic, Polish, and heathenish, were to them synonymous words. Thus, whilst the light of Christianity everywhere carried the first dawn of life into the night of Slavic antiquity; the early history of Poland affords more than any other part of the christian world a melancholy proof, how the passions and blindness of men operated to counterbalance that holy influence. But although so unfavourably disposed towards the language, it cannot be said that the influence of the foreign clergy was in other respects injurious to the literary cultivation of the country. Benedictine monks founded in the beginning of the eleventh century the first Polish schools; and numerous convents of their own and other orders presented to the scholar an asylum, both when in the year 1241 the Mongols broke into the country, and also during the civil wars which were caused by the family dissensions of Pjast's successors. Several chronicles in Latin were written by Poles long before the history of the Polish literature begins, and Polish no-

⁵¹ See p. 347 sq.

blomen went to Paris, Bologna, and Prague, to study sciences, for the very elements of which their own language afforded them no means.

Polish writers are in the habit of dividing the history of their language into five periods.⁵² The *first* extends from the introduction of Christianity to Casimir the Great, A. D. 1333.

The *second* period extends from A. D. 1333 to A. D. 1506, or the reign of Siegmund I.

The *third* period is the golden age of the Polish literature, and closes with the foundation of schools of the Jesuits, A. D. 1622.

The *fourth* period comprises the time of the preponderance of the Jesuits, and ends with the revival of literature by Konarski, A. D. 1760.

The *fifth* period comprehends the interval from A. D. 1760 to the present time.

Before we enter into a regular historical account of these different periods, we will devote a few words to the formation and the character of the language itself.

The extent of country in which the Polish language is predominant, is much smaller than would naturally be concluded from the great circuit of territory, which at the time of its power and independence, was comprised under the kingdom of Poland. We do not allude to the sixteenth century, when Poland was the most powerful state in the north; when the Teutonic knights, the conquerers of Prussia, were compelled to acknowledge its protection; and when not only were Livonia and Courland, the one a component part of the Polish kingdom, and the other a Polish fief, but even the ancient Smolensk and the venerable Kief, the royal seat of Vladimir, and the Russian provinces adjacent to Galicia, all belonged to Poland. We speak of this kingdom as it was at the time of its first partition between Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Of the four or five millions of inhabitants in the provinces united with Russia at the three successive partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795, only one and a half million are Poles, and speak dialects of that language;⁵³ in White and Black

⁵² See Bentkowski's *Hist. literatury Polsk.* Warsaw 1814, Vol. I. pp. 162—176.

⁵³ The statistical information respecting the Russian-Polish provinces is very imperfect, and contains the most striking contradictions. Benken gives the number of inhabitants at four millions; Wiehmann in 1813, at 6,380,000; Arsenjef at seven millions. According to Bröm-

Russia, the Russniaks are by far more numerous ; and in Lithuania the Lithuanians. Besides the independent language of these latter, the Malo Russian and White Russian dialects are spoken in these provinces ; and all documents of the grand-duchy of Lithuania before it was united with Poland in A. D. 1569, were written in the latter.⁵⁴

The Polish language is farther spoken (1) by the inhabitants of the kingdom of Poland formed in 1815, three and a half millions in number, or reckoned together with the Poles of the Polish-Russian provinces, five millions ; (2) by the inhabitants of Galicia, belonging to Austria, and the Poles in the Austrian part of Silesia, about three millions ; (3) by the inhabitants of the small republic of Cracow, about one hundred thousand ; and (4) by the inhabitants of the Prussian grand-duchy of Posen, and a part of the province called Western Prussia, together with the Poles in Silesia and the Kassubes in Pomerania ; in all less than two millions.⁵⁵

Thus the Polish language is spoken by a population of about ten millions. Like all living languages, it has different dialects, and is in one place spoken with greater purity than in another. As these varieties, however, are neither very striking nor have ever had an influence on literature, they do not concern us here.

The ancient Polish language seems to have been very nearly related to the dialects of the Tchekhes and the Sorabian Vends. Although very little is known in respect to the circumstances and progress of the formation of the language into its present state, it is sufficiently obvious, that it has been developed from the conflict of its natural elements with the Latin and German idioms. Of the other Slavic dialects, the Bohemian is the only one which has exerted any influence upon the Polish

sen's *Russland und das russische Reich*, Berl. 1819, there are not more than 850,000 Poles among them, nearly all noblemen ; the lower classes are Russniaks and Lithuanians. In our statement of the number of Poles in these provinces, we have followed Schaffarik.

⁵⁴ See. p. 361.

⁵⁵ These statements seem to disagree with those of Hassel, which rest on the authority of the returns of 1820. He states that Austrian Poland has 4,226,969 inhabitants ; Prussian Poland, 2,584,124. The population of the former consists however of a large proportion of Russniaks, and more especially of Jews ; the latter has a similar proportion of German inhabitants.

tongue. The Italian and Turkish words introduced during the dominion of an Italian priesthood, and through the political relations of the Poles with the Turks, never entered deeply into the body of the language; and might be easily exchanged for better Polish forms of expression.

Of all the Slavic dialects, the Polish presents to the foreigner the most difficulties; partly on account of the great variety and nicety of shades in the pronunciation of the vowels, and from the combination of consonants in such a way, that only a Slavic tongue can conquer them, and cause the apparent harshness in some measure to disappear;⁵⁶ partly on account of its refined and artificial grammatical structure. In this latter respect it differs materially from the Russian language; which although equally rich, is remarkable for its simplicity and perspicuity. The Polish and Bohemian idioms, in the opinion of the best judges, are above all others capable of faithfully imitating the refinements of the classical languages; and the Polish prose is modelled after the Latin with a perfection, which, in the golden age of Polish literature, was one of its characteristic features. It is therefore surprising, that the Polish language in poetry, although in other respects highly cultivated, does not admit the introduction of the classical prosody. We mean, the Polish language in its present state; for it is very probable, that in its original character it possessed, in common with all the other Slavic languages, the elements of a regular system of *long* and *short* syllables. So long, however, as there have existed Polish poets, they have not measured, but, in imitation of the French, have *counted* the syllables. With the exception of a few poets of the last period, who have written in blank verse, and a few weak attempts to adapt the Greek principles of accent to the Polish language, all Polish poetry is, like the French, in rhyme; and the French Alexandrine is the favourite form of the Polish poets.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ We doubt whether any but Slavic organs would be able to pronounce the name of the place, to which the college of Zamosc was removed. It is Szczecbrzeszyu.

⁵⁷ Zaluski and Minasowrez wrote verses with *counted* not *measured* syllables, without rhyme; Przybylski's and Staszye's translations of Homer are in hexameters. That rhyme is not natural to the Polish language, is evident from the ancient popular poetry of the other Slavic nations; which are all without rhyme. The author of the work

FIRST PERIOD.

From the introduction of Christianity to Casimir the Great, A. D. 1333.

In dividing the history of the Polish literature into five periods, we follow the example and authority of Bentkowski; although it seems to be singular, to pretend to give an account of a literature which did not yet exist. The history of the Polish literature does not properly begin before the close of the second period; although that of the *literary cultivation* of the nation commences with the beginning of that period; and a few slight traces of it are to be found even in the middle of the first. Of the language itself, nothing is left but the names of places and persons, and some Polish words scattered through the Latin documents of the time, written without orthographic rules, and therefore often hardly intelligible. There exists an ancient Polish war-song, the author of which is said to have been St. Adalbert, a Bohemian by birth, who was bishop of Prague at the end of the tenth century;⁵⁸ but even according to Rakowiecki, a philologist who is more disposed than any other to find traces of an *early* cultivation of the Slavic nations, and especially of the Poles, this song, or rather hymn, is, in its present form, not older than the fourteenth century. All that is extant from this period is written in Latin. Besides some unimportant documents and an anonymous biography of Adalbert, there remain several historical works of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Martin Gallus, a Frenchman, who lived in Poland between 1110 and 1135, is considered as the oldest Polish historian.

Volkslieder der Polen, assumes the absence of rhyme in some of them as a proof of their antiquity.

⁵⁸ This song, called *Boga Rodzica*, can only be named a war-song, because the Poles used to sing it when advancing to battle. It is rather a prayer to the Virgin, ending with a sixfold Amen. In a poetical respect it has no value. It is printed in Bowring's *Specimens of the Polish Poets*, p. 12, together with the music, copied from a manuscript which is said to be from the twelfth century. No translation is added. It is remarkable that this hymn is still sung, or at least was so in the year 1812, in the churches of the places where St. Adalbert lived and died, viz. at Kola and at Gnesen. Niemcewicz, who published it, states that he himself heard it at that time at the latter place.

Other chronicles of Poland were written by the bishops of Cracow, Matthew Cholewa, and Vincent, son of Kadlubec, who died in 1223; by Bogufal, bishop of Posen, some twenty years later; and by Godzislaw Baszko, about thirty years later still. Strzemb-ski wrote towards the middle of the thirteenth century a history of the popes and Roman emperors. In 1008 duke Boleslav, the son of Miesislav, invited Benedictine monks to Poland, who founded convents at Sieciechov and Lysagora, with schools attached to them. This example was followed at a later period by other orders; and in Poland longer than in any other country, education was entirely in the hands of the ecclesiastics. For several hundred years, the natives were excluded from all clerical dignities and privileges, and the numerous monasteries were filled only with foreign monks. Even as late as the fifteenth century, foreigners had decidedly the preference. In the year 1237 Pelka, archbishop of Gnesen, directed the institution of schools by the priests; but added the recommendation to the bishops, that they should employ as teachers only Germans who understood Polish. In A. D. 1285 at the synod of Leczyc, they went a step farther in excluding all foreigners, who were ignorant of the Polish language, from the places of ecclesiastical teachers and instructors. But more than eighty years later, it was found necessary at the synod of Kalisz in 1357 to repeat the same decree; and even a century after this time, in A. D. 1460, John Ostrorog complained that all the rich convents were occupied by foreign monks.⁵⁰ These ignorant men were wont to throw into the fire the few writings in the barbarian language, which they could discover; and as instructors of the youth, were able to fill the heads of the young nobility with the most unnatural prejudices against the vernacular tongue of their own country. Besides the clergy, many other foreigners also settled in Poland, as mechanics and traders, especially Germans. But as they all lived merely in the cities of Poland, they and their language had far less influence on the people, than was the case in Bohemia, where they mingled with all classes.

⁵⁰ See Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Slav. Sprache*, p. 421.

SECOND PERIOD.

From Casimir the Great to Siegmund L. A. D. 1333 to A. D. 1406.

Casimir is one of the few princes, who acquired the name of the Great not by victories and conquests, but through the real benefits of laws, national courts of justice, and means of education, which he procured for his subjects. His father, Vladislaus Lokietek, had resumed the royal title, which hitherto had been alternately taken and dropped; and was the first who permanently united Great and Little Poland. Under Casimir, the present Austrian kingdom of Galicia, which, together with Lodomeria, the present Russian government Vladimir, was then called Red Russia, was added by inheritance. Lithuania became connected with Poland as a Polish fief in the year 1386, when queen Hedevig, heiress of the crown of Poland, married Jagello, duke of Lithuania; but was first completely incorporated as a component part of the kingdom of Poland only so late as the year 1569. Masovia had been thus united some forty years earlier. At the time of the marriage of Hedevig and Jagello, the latter caused himself to be baptized, and introduced Christianity into Lithuania, where he himself in many cases acted as an apostle.

As to the influence of Casimir the Great upon the literary cultivation of his subjects, it was more mediate than immediate. Whilst his cotemporary and neighbour Charles IV of Bohemia, loved and patronized the language of that kindred nation, Casimir paid no attention whatever to the vernacular tongue of his country; nor was any thing done under his administration for the developement of that rich dialect. This king indeed, as early as A. D. 1347, laid the foundation of the high school of Cracow; but the regular organization and influence of this institution dates only from half a century later. But by introducing a better order of things, by providing his subjects with their earliest code of laws, by instituting the first constitutional diets, by fortifying the cities and protecting the tillers of the soil against a wild and oppressive nobility, he established a better tone of moral feeling throughout the nation. A seed sown in such ground, necessarily springs up slowly, but surely.

With Casimir the race of the Pjasts expired. His nephew, Louis of Hungary, a prince of the house of Anjou, was elected

king, whose reign was spent in constant war, and left no trace of care for the internal cultivation of the country. The limitation of the power of the sovereign, and the exorbitant privileges of the Polish nobility, date from the reign of this prince; he resided mostly in Hungary, and granted to the Poles all their demands, in order to prevent the alienation of their crown from his house. After his death his second daughter, Hedevig, was preferred to the emperor Sigismund, who was married to the eldest, Mary, because this prince refused to subscribe the conditions demanded by the Polish Estates. Hedevig married Jagello of Lithuania; and under their descendants the Jagellons, who reigned nearly two centuries, Poland rose to the summit of its power and glory. With Siegmund I, the grandson of Jagello, but the fifth king after him, a new period of the Polish literature begins.

The history of the Polish language, as we said in our introduction, properly commences only with the close, or at the utmost with the middle of the present period, when in the year 1488 the first printing office was erected at Cracow. There is indeed said to have existed a Polish translation of the Bible, made by order of queen Hedevig before the year 1390; and writers of the sixteenth century speak of having seen a Polish Bible, either translated anew, copied, or prepared, for Sophia, fourth queen of Jagello, by her chaplain, Andreas of Jaszowicz.⁶⁰ There are still some biblical fragments extant, which appear to be derived from this period; although no complete copy has been preserved. The oldest other manuscripts extant in the Polish language, are a portion of the preface to an ancient statute of Casimir; several documents relating to suits at law, etc. from the last half of the fourteenth century; and fragments of translations of statutes, the ten commandments in verse, a translation of one of Wickliffe's hymns, and a few other unimportant productions of the fifteenth century.

The orthography of the language, and especially the adaption of the Latin alphabet to it, seems to have troubled the few writers of this period exceedingly; they appear to have founded their principles alternately on the Latin, the Bohemian, and the German methods of combining letters; an inconsistency, which adds greatly to the difficulties of modern Slavic etymology.⁶¹

⁶⁰ Dobrovsky's *Slovanka*, Vol. II. p. 237.

⁶¹ See Schaffarik, pp. 420—424.

Annalists of Polish history, who wrote in Latin, were also not wanting in this period. Sig. Rositzius, Dzierzva,* and more especially John Dlugosz, bishop of Lemberg, wrote histories and chronicles of Poland; and the work of the latter is still considered as highly valuable.

THIRD PERIOD.

From Sigismund I to the establishment of the schools of the Jesuits in Cracow, A. D.
1505 to A. D. 1622.

In northern climates, the bright and glowing days of summer follow in almost immediate succession a long and gloomy winter, without allowing to the attentive mind of the lover of nature the enjoyment of observing, during a transient interval of spring, the gradual developement of the beauty of the earth. Thus the flowers of Polish literature burst out from their buds with a rapidity unequalled in literary history, and were ripened into fruit with the same prodigious celerity.

The university of Cracow had been reinstituted under Jagello in A. D. 1400, and organized after the model of that of Prague. Although the most flourishing period of this institution was the sixteenth century, yet it presented during the fifteenth to the Polish nobility a good opportunity of studying the classics; and it is doubtless through this preparatory familiarity with the ancient writers, that the appearance to which we have alluded, must be principally accounted for. It was moreover now the epoch, when the genius of christian Europe made the most decided efforts to shake off the chains which had fettered the freedom of thought. The doctrines of the German Reformers, although the number of their professed disciples was in proportion smaller than in Bohemia, had nevertheless a decided influence upon the general direction of the public mind. The wild flame of false religious zeal, which in Poland also under the sons and immediate successors of Jagello, had kindled the faggots in which the disciples of the new doctrines were called to seal the truth of their conviction with their blood, was extinguished before the milder wisdom of Sigismund I; although even the early part of his reign was not yet entirely free from religious persecution. The activity of the

* His *Chronicon Polonorum* was reprinted at Warsaw in 1824; together with Vincent Kadlubeck's *Res gestae principum ac regum Poloniae*.

inquisition was restrained. But the new doctrines found a more decided support in Sigismund Augustus. Poland became, under his administration, the seat of a toleration then unequalled in the world. Communities of the most different religious principles formed themselves, at first under the indulgence of the king and the government, and finally under the protection of the law.⁶² Even the boldest theological sceptics of the age, the two Socini, found in Poland an asylum. The Bohemian language, which already possessed so extensive a literature, acquired during this period a great influence upon the Polish. The number of clerical writers, however, which in Bohemia was so great, was comparatively only small in Poland. Indeed it is worthy of remark, that while in other countries the diffusion of information and general illumination proceeded from the clergy, not indeed as a body, but from individuals among the clergy, in Poland it was always the highest nobility who were at the head of literary enterprises or institutions for mental cultivation. There are many princely names among the writers of this period; and there are still so among those of the present day. This may however be one of the causes, why education in Poland was

⁶² Among these were the Unitarians, called also Anti-trinitarians, modern Arians, and afterwards Socinians. They called themselves Polish Brethren. Their principal school and printing office was at Racow; several of their teachers were distinguished for learning, their communities were wealthy and flourishing, and not a few of the highest families of Poland belonged to them. The doctrines of the two exiled Italians, Lelio and Fausto Socini, uncle and nephew, found among them only a conditional approbation; most of them were unwilling to receive Fausto, who developed his views more openly than his uncle, into their community. Internal dissensions were the result, and the establishment of new and smaller congregations. A disturbance among the students at Racow in 1638, gave to the catholics and to the other protestants a welcome pretext for persecuting them; in 1658 their denomination was ultimately suppressed, and the choice left to them between the adoption of the catholic religion or exile within three years. A part of them emigrated to Germany, where they were soon merged in other protestant denominations; others went to Transylvania, where the Unitarians, about fifty thousand in number, belonged and still belong to the denominations acknowledged by the state, and enjoy all civil rights. They have two high schools, at Klausenburg and at Thoarda; but are far from being distinguished for learning. See Meusel's *Staatengeschichte*, p. 555. *Lambieneci Historia Reformationis Polonicae*, etc. etc.

entirely confined to the higher classes; while even during this brilliant period, the peasantry remained in the lowest state of degradation, and *nothing* was done to elevate their minds or to better their condition. For it is to the clergy, that the common people have always to look as their natural and bounden teachers; it is to the clergy, that a low state of cultivation among the poorer classes is the most dishonourable. During this period, however, the opportunity was presented to the people of becoming better acquainted with the Scriptures, through several translations of them into the Polish language, not only by the different protestant denominations, but also by the catholics themselves. Indeed, all the translations of the Bible extant in the Polish language, are from the sixteenth or the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁶³ We meet also among the productions of the literature of this period, a few catechisms and postillae, written expressly for the instruction of the common people by some eminent Lutheran and reformed Polish ministers. But the want of means for acquiring even the most elementary information, was so great, that only a very few among the lower classes were able to read them. The doctrines of the Reformers, which everywhere else were favoured principally by the middle and lower classes, in Poland found their chief support

⁶³ An enumeration of the Polish versions of the Bible may be acceptable to the reader. The New Testament was first translated by the Lutheran Seklucyan, who was a Greek scholar, and printed at Königsberg 1551, three times reprinted before 1555. Afterwards for catholics by Leonard, from the Vulgate, reviewed by Leopolda, Cracow 1556. Of the Old Testament, the Psalter alone was several times translated and repeatedly printed. The whole Bible was first translated for the catholics by Leonard, from the Vulgate, and reviewed by Leopolda, Cracow 1561, reprinted in 1575 and 1577. Two years later by an anonymous translator from the original languages, for Calvinists, Brzesc 1563. Again from the original languages by Budny, an Unitarian clergyman, 1570, reprinted in 1572. From the Vulgate by the Jesuit Wuiet, Cracow 1599, reprinted at Breslau in 1740 in 8vo, and 1771 in 4to with the Latin text. From the original languages by Paliurus, Wengierscius, and Micolaiewius, for Calvinists, Dantzic 1632, the first Bible in 8vo, all the former being in fol. or 4to, reprinted at Amsterdam 1660, at Halle 1726, at Königsberg 1738, 1779, and at Berlin 1810, by the Bible Society. See Ringelstube's *Nachricht von den polnischen Bibeln*, Danz, 1744. Bentkowski's *Hist. liter. pol.* Vol. II. p. 494. *Slovanka* Vol. I. p. 141. Vol. II. p. 228. Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Slav. Spr.* p. 424.

among the nobility. Comparatively few of the people adhered to them. There was a time, between 1550 and 1650, when half the senate,⁶⁴ and even more than half of the nobility, consisted of Lutherans and Calvinists. In the year 1570, these two denominations, together with the Bohemian Brethren, formed a union of their churches by the treaty of Sendomir for external or political purposes. In 1573, by another treaty known under the name of *pax dissidentium*, they were acknowledged by the state and the king, and all the rights of the catholics were granted to the members of these three denominations, the Greeks, and Armenians. The want, however, of an accurate determination of their mutual relation to each other, occasioned repeatedly in the course of the following century bloody dissensions. The protestants succeeded, nevertheless, in maintaining their rights, until the years 1717 and 1718, when their number having gradually yet considerably diminished, they were deprived of their suffrages in the diet. Their adversaries went still farther; and after struggling against oppression of all sorts, the dissidents had at length, in 1736, to be contented

⁶⁴ The Polish senate was not a body, the members of which were elected for a certain term; as those not acquainted with the Polish constitution might be disposed to believe. It was composed of all the archbishops and bishops, the waiwodes and castellans, i. e. the titled nobility, and the principal ministers of the king. It was thus in some measure the organ of the government and of the clergy, in opposition to the national representatives or the mass of the nobility. This body was not established until towards the close of the fifteenth century. Before 1466—70, every nobleman who chose, made his personal appearance in the senate at the summons of the king; but Casimir, the son of Jagello, in his frequent want of money and men, repeated these summons so often, that the nobility found personal appearance inconvenient, and selected in their provincial conventions *nuntii*, to represent the nation, or rather the nobility; without however giving up the right of personal attendance. The *nuntii*, whose number was not fixed, were bound to appear, had the right to grant or to refuse duties, and to act as the advisers of the king. In 1505 the law was passed that without their consent the constitution could not be changed. At the diet in A. D. 1652 it occurred for the first time, that a single *nuntius* opposed and annulled by his *liberum veto* the united resolutions of the whole convention. On this example a regular right was very soon founded and acknowledged. Deputies of cities were occasionally invited to the diet, but only in extraordinary cases.

with being acknowledged as *tolerated sects*. After the accession of Stanislaus Poniatowsky to the throne in 1766, the dissidents attempted to regain their former rights. In this they were supported by several protestant powers; but more especially by Russia, who thus improved the opportunity of increasing its influence in Polish affairs. In consequence of this powerful support, the laws directed against the dissidents were repealed; and in 1775 all their old privileges were restored to them, except the right of being eligible to the stations of ministers of state and senators. In more recent times the protestants have been admitted to all the rights of the catholics; although the catholic is still the predominant religion of the kingdom of Poland.

We have permitted ourselves this digression, and anticipation of time; although we shall have an opportunity of again returning to this subject. The influence of protestantism on the literature of Poland cannot be denied, although its doctrines and their immediate consequence, the private examination and interpretation of the Scriptures, have occupied the minds and pens of the Poles less than those of any other nation among whom they have been received. We now return to the sixteenth century.

The Polish language acquired during this period such a degree of refinement, that even at the revival of literature and taste in modern times, it was necessary to add nothing for its improvement, although the course of time naturally had occasioned some change in it. Several able men occupied themselves with its systematic culture by means of grammars and dictionaries. Zabrowski, Statorius and Januscowski wrote grammars; Macynski compiled the first dictionary. The first part of Knapski's *Thesaurus*, an esteemed work even at the present day, was first published in 1621, and may therefore be considered as a production of this period. But the practical use, which so many gifted writers made of the language for a variety of subjects, contributed still more to its cultivation. The point which acquired less perfection, and which appeared the most difficult to subject to fixed rules, was that of orthography. How little the Latin alphabet is adapted to denote Slavic sounds, is evident in the Polish language. Indeed the reputed harshness of this language rests partly on the manner in which they were obliged to combine several consonants, which to the eye of the occidental European can only be united by intermediate vowels. On the other hand, it is just this system of letters which forms a connecting link be-

tween the Polish language and those of western Europe; and although most Slavic philologists regret that the Latin alphabet ever should have been adopted for any Slavic language in preference to the Cyrillic, yet Grimm thinks that the adoption of the former, "with appropriate additions, corresponding to the peculiar sounds of each language and dialect, would have been beneficial to all European languages."⁶⁵

Although the art of printing was introduced into Poland as early as 1488, when the first printing office was established at Cracow, yet printed books first became generally diffused between the years 1530 and 1540. The first work printed in Poland was a calendar for the year 1490; the first book printed in the Polish language was Bonaventura's life of Jesus, translated for the queen of Hungary, and published in 1522. In the second half of the sixteenth century nearly every city, which had a considerable school, had also its printing office.⁶⁶ The schools were unfortunately confined to the cities; nothing was done for the peasantry, who have remained even to the most recent times in a state of physical and moral degradation, with which that of the common people of no other country except Russia, can be compared. A peasant who could read or write, would have been considered as a prodigy. So much the more, however, was done for the national education of the nobility. In the year 1579 the university of Wilna was instituted; in 1594, another university was created at Zamosc in Little Poland, by a private nobleman, the great chancellor Zamoyski; which however survived only a few years, and perished in the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁶⁷ Numerous other schools of a less elevated character were founded at Thorn, Danzig, Lissa, etc. most of them for protestants.

So early as under Casimir, the son of Jagello, the Polish language began to be employed as the language of the court. Under his grandson Sigismund Augustus, the public laws and decrees were promulgated in the vernacular tongue of the country. But a language which thus issued from the court, was necessa-

⁶⁵ Preface to Vuk's Servian Grammar, p. xxiii.

⁶⁶ See Schaffarik, p. 414. Bantkie's *Geschichte der Krakauer Buchdruckereyen*.

⁶⁷ It was afterwards reinstated in the form of a large gymnasium by one of chancellor Zamoyski's descendants, and removed to Szczeszyń. See *Letters on Poland*, Edinb. 1823, p. 95.

nily also dependent on the changes of the court. The influence of the French prince, Henry of Valois, successor of Sigismund Augustus, could not be considerable, as he occupied the throne only two months. But Stephen Bathory, prince of Transylvania, the brother-in-law of Sigismund Augustus, who was elected after Henry of Valois had deserted the country, was as a foreigner in the habit of interspersing his conversation and writings with Latin words, when the proper Polish words, of which language he had only an imperfect knowledge, did not occur to him. It is hardly credible that such a habit, or rather the imitation of it among his courtiers, could have had any influence on a language already so well established and cultivated, as the Polish idiom was at the close of the sixteenth century. The Polish literary historians, however, ascribe to Bathory's influence the fashion which began at this time to prevail, of debasing the purity of the Polish language by an intermixture of Latin words and phrases.⁶⁸

Although the Polish literature acquired during this period a kind of universality, and there were few departments of science, familiar to that age, which were not to some extent cultivated in it, yet it owes its principal lustre to the contributions made in it to history, poetry, and rhetoric. The didactic style did not reach the perfection of the historical; nor did Polish literature acquire any wide domain in purely scientific productions. In accordance with the national tendency, the mass of distinguished talents was devoted to those interests, which yield an immediate profit in life, or which are themselves rather the results of empirical knowledge, than of abstract contemplation, viz. to politics, to eloquence, and to poetry, in so far as this latter is considered not as a creative power, but as the most appropriate means for expressing and describing the emotions, passions, and actions of man. There have however always been not a few gifted Poles, who have cultivated the field of science for its own sake, without reference to the practical importance of their labours; and there are more especially at the present time many distinguished names among the Polish mathematicians, natural philosophers, and chemists. In Copernicus himself, born indeed of parents of German extraction, and in a city (Thorn) mostly inhabited by German colonists, but also born a Polish subject and educated in a Polish university, Poland and Germany seem to have equal

⁶⁸ See Schaffarik, p. 426.

rights.⁶⁹ The principal reason why didactic prose did not acquire the same high degree of cultivation as the historical style, is, that all scientific works during this period, which was that of the formation of the language, were written by preference in Latin. Indeed, the authority of the classical languages did not suffer at all from the rising of the national literature. It is on the contrary a remarkable fact, that the cultivation of the vernacular tongue of the country and the study of the Latin language in Poland, have ever proceeded with equal steps. The most eminent writers and orators of this period, who employed the Polish language, managed also the Latin with the greatest skill and dexterity. Even for common conversation, Latin and Polish were used alternately. Sigismund I, when separated from his first queen, Barbara Zapolska, maintained with her a correspondence in Latin; his second queen, Bona Sforza, used to employ that language in their most familiar intercourse.⁷⁰ Chojsnin, in his Memoirs of the election of Henry of Valois, observes, that among a hundred Polish noblemen, there were hardly to be found two, who did not understand Latin, German, and Italian; and Martin Kromer goes so far as to state, that perhaps in Latium itself fewer persons had spoken Latin fluently, than in Poland.⁷¹ The reputation of the Latin poet Casimir Sarbiewski, in Latin Sarbievius, spread throughout all Europe. Most

⁶⁹ Whether Copernicus is to be called a Pole or a German has been and is still a matter of dispute, and has been managed on the side of the Poles with the utmost bitterness and passion. The Poles have recently given expression to their claim upon him by erecting to him a monument at Cracow, and celebrating the third centennial anniversary of the completion of his system of the world, which took place in A. D. 1530. Let the question respecting Copernicus be decided as it may, Poland may doubtless lay claim to many other eminent natural philosophers as her sons; e. g. Vitellio-Ciolek, who was the first in Europe to investigate the theory of light, in the beginning of the thirteenth century; Brudzewski, the teacher of Copernicus; Martinus of Olkusz, the proper author of the new or Gregorian calendar, which was introduced sixty-four years after him, etc.

⁷⁰ See Macherszynski's *Geschichte der Lateinischen Sprache in Polen*, Cracow 1833. Dr Connor in his *History of Poland*, 1698, speaking of the following period, says, that even the common people in Poland spoke Latin, and that his servant used to speak with him in that language. See *Letters on Poland*, Edinb. 1823. p. 108.

⁷¹ *De originibus et rebus gestis Polonorum*, lib. XXX.

Polish poets were equally successful both in Polish and Latin verse. As the former language first developed itself in poetry, we therefore, in our enumeration of the principal writers of this time, begin with the poets.

Ray of Naglowic, d. 1569, is called the father of Polish poetry. Most of his productions are of the religious kind, chiefly in verse, but also orations and postillae. His chief work was a translation of the Psalms.⁷² His principal followers were the Kochanowskis, a name of threefold lustre. John Kochanowski, d. 1584, by far the most distinguished of them, published likewise a translation of David's psalms, which is still considered as a classical work; in his other poems, Pindar, Anacreon, and Horace were alternately his models, without diminishing the original value of his pieces.⁷³ His brother Andrew translated Virgil's *Aeneid*; his nephew Peter, with more talent and success, the great epics of Tasso and Ariosto. Rybinski maintains, as a lyric poet, in the opinion of several critics, the same rank with John Kochanowski; like him he wrote Polish and Latin verses, and was created poet laureate. Simon Szymonowicz, called Simonides, d. 1629, obtained likewise the poetical crown from the pope Clement VIII; indeed his Latin odes secured him a lasting fame over all Europe, and procured him the appellation of the Latin Pindar. In Polish he wrote mostly idylls, after the model of Theocritus, Bion and Moschus; but these, as their chief merit consists in the sweetness and delicacy of the language, only natives are able fully to appreciate.⁷⁴ The productions of his friend and cotemporary Zimorowicz, have the same general character, but are of less value in respect to diction. Other lyrical poets of merit may be named; e. g. the archbishop of Lemberg, Grochowski, a very productive writer; Czahrow-

⁷² *Psalterz Dawidow s modlitwami*, 1555.

⁷³ The Polish works of this great poet, who is still considered as the chief ornament of the Polish Parnassus, were first collected in four volumes, Cracow 1584—90. After going through several editions, they have recently been printed at Breslau, 1824, in a stereotype edition. Bowring gives among his 'Specimens' some of the sweetest pieces of Kochanowski.

⁷⁴ The oldest edition extant of his Polish pastorals, was printed at Zamoscz, 1614, under the title *Sielanki*. They were last printed, together with other eclogues, in the collection of Mostowski, *Sielanki Polskie*, Warsaw 1805. There are some specimens of his poetry in Bowring's work.

ski, Klonowicz called also *Acernus*, and others.⁷⁵ As poets of a religious character we name here together, without reference to the denomination to which they belonged,—since most of the Polish poetical productions of this age were of a higher character than to suffer the intrusion of polemics,—Dambrowski, Bartoszewski, Miaskowski, whose hymns are considered as the finest of that period, Sudrovius, Turnowski and others. The age was also rich in satires and epigrams, Polish as well as Latin. Productions of this class by the two Zbylitowskis, Pudlowski, Kraiewski, and a great many others, are still extant. The facility of rhyme in a language so rich in rhymes as the Polish, seduced several writers to use verse as a vehicle for the most trivial thoughts, or for subjects the very nature of which is opposed to poetry. Thus Paprocki of Glogol, who is highly esteemed as a diligent historian and accurate investigator of the past, wrote his numerous works on genealogy and heraldry mostly in rhyme.⁷⁶ Other historical poems were also written, which perhaps would not have been utterly deficient in merit, had they been transferred into prose.

Eloquence, so nearly related to poetry, and which nevertheless, perhaps on that very account, should be distinguished from it by the most definite limits, is a gift, the cultivation of which may be expected above all in a republic. The Poles possess indeed all the necessary qualities for public orators; and eminent talents not only for poetical eloquence, but also for the pulpit, are not uncommon among them. Gornicki, d. after 1591, Czarnkowski, Odachowski, and others, but especially the first named, were considered as the most distinguished orators of the age. The eloquence of the pulpit was exhibited in its highest eminence by Skarga, court preacher of Sigismund III, whom his cotemporaries used to call the Polish Chrysostom; and by the learned Jesuit Wuiiek, who also translated the Bible into Polish.⁷⁷ The sermons and orations of both of them, besides numerous other theological productions, were published at the time. Oth-

⁷⁵ This latter was honoured by his countrymen with the title of the Sarmatian Ovid; but his pieces, according to Bowring, are not only licentious, but also vulgar. See *Specimen of the Polish Poets*, p. 29.

⁷⁶ The same individual has been mentioned as a Bohemian writer; see above, p. 453.

⁷⁷ See note 63.

er theological writers of some distinction were, among the catholics, Stanislaus Karnkowski archbishop of Gnesen, Bierkowski who was Skarga's successor, Bialobrzski, Kuczborski, the Jesuit Rosciszewski and others; among the protestants, Seklucyan the translator of the Polish Bible for protestants;⁷⁸ Koszatski of Żarnowec, Radomski, Gilowski, and Budny, one of the leaders of the Unitarians, who also translated the Bible into Polish from the original languages.⁷⁹ We must remark, that the Polish theological literature of this period evinced much less of a polemical spirit than might have been expected, in an age when that of the neighbouring countries, Bohemia and Germany, abounded in controversial books and pamphlets, replete with unchristian bitterness and doctrinal rigidity. For productions of this character we have to look in Poland to the following period. The wise moderation of the two Sigismunds and of Stephen Bathory, seems to have had a prodigious influence on the minds of the nation, to pacify them and keep them within appropriate limits.

History, especially national history, was justly considered as one of the subjects most worthy of human attention. History is the great school, in which nations appear as the pupils, experience as the teacher; and the fate of mankind depends on a wise application of the great moral lessons which they daily receive. Most of the Polish historians of this age preferred however the Latin language; but their productions are too intimately connected with Poland to be separated from its literature, and may therefore be named here. The Polish chronicle written by Matthew of Miechow, body physician to Sigismund I, and published in 1521, was the first historical work printed in Poland. Martin Kromer, bishop of Ermeland or Warmia, called the *Livy of Poland*, Wapowski, Guagnini, an Italian, but naturalized and ennobled in Poland, and Piasecki, a protestant, distinguished for his frankness, wrote works on Polish history. Koialowicz wrote on that of Lithuania. They all wrote in Latin. The first who published an historical work in Polish was Martin Bielski, d. 1576. His chronicle of Poland, which is of high value in every respect, is written in a style so beautiful, that it was called *le style d'or*. His son Joachim continued this work, as far as to the reign of Sigismund III.⁸⁰ Another Polish chronicle, com-

⁷⁸ See note 63.

⁷⁹ See note 63.

⁸⁰ This work was first printed at Cracow in 1597, under the title

piled with more erudition than taste, was written by Strykowski, the author of numerous works on various subjects.

Other writers of merit—some of whom published original works on portions of history, while others translated the Latin volumes of their countrymen or those of classic historical authors—were, Wargoeki, the Polish translator of Julius Cæsar, and other Roman writers; Orzechowski, also distinguished as an orator; Januszowski, Blazowski, Paszkowski, Cyprian Bazylik, and others. Works on tactics were published by the grand field-marshal Tarnowski, by Strubicz and Cielecki. Collections of statutes and laws were made by Herbart, Sapieha, Groicki, Sarnicki, and others.

It still remains to note the progress made in the philosophical sciences. We remarked above, that scientific works in Poland were mostly written in Latin; and since the case with them is different from that of historical works,—because, as the results of scientific examination and discovery, they are independent of the country where they are written, and belong to the world,—we therefore mention here only those works which were published in the Polish language. Falimierz, in Latin Phalimirus, first ventured to use the vernacular tongue of the country for a scientific book. He published as early as 1534 a work on natural history, and especially *materia medica*. The first medical work in the Polish language was written in 1541 by Peter of Kobylin; the first mathematical work by Grzebski. Their example was followed by Letosz, Rosciszewski, Andrew of Kobylin, Umieſtowski, Spiczynski, Siennik, Oczko, Gruinius, Syrenski, in Latin Sirenus, etc. all physicians, astronomers, botanists, etc.⁸¹

FOURTH PERIOD.

From the erection of the Cracovian Jesuit Schools in A. D. 1622, to the revival of science in A. D. 1760.

The noble race of the Jagellons had become extinct on the death of Sigismund Augustus, in 1572.⁸² Poland had become formally

Kronika Polska. The first part of it was republished at Warsaw in 1832, forming the sixth volume of the great collection of ancient Polish authors published by the bookseller Galezowski.

⁸¹ For more complete information respecting the writers of this period, see Bantkowski's *Hist. lit. Pol.* Vol. I. Schaffarik's *Geschichte*, etc.

⁸² We mean the direct male descendants of Jagello; for descen-

an elective monarchy. Henry of Valois was the first to subscribe the *pacta conventa*, the fundamental law of the national liberty; the nation being understood to consist legally only of the nobility.⁶³ Stephen Bathory's strength kept the discordant elements together, and while at home he took care to improve the administration of justice, and erected the high tribunals of Petricau, Lublin and Wilna, his victorious arms in his contest with Russia raised Poland for a short time to the summit of its glory. But under his successor Sigismund III, a Swedish prince, and nephew of Sigismund Augustus and of Stephen, began that anarchy which is to be considered as the principal cause of Poland's final calamitous fate. For about fifty years, the Poles still maintained with equal valour, though with alternate good and ill success, their warlike character abroad; even while internal dissensions and bloody party strife raged in their own unhappy country. But to such fundamental evils, combined with the rising power of Russia, with the revolt of the Kossaks in 1654 occasioned principally by religious oppression, and with the gradual but sure advancement of a new rival in the elector of Brandenburg, hitherto considered as a weak neighbour—to all these influences, the building thus sapped in its foundation could yield no resistance, and its walls could not but give way, when they were suddenly shaken by the hands of avaricious and powerful enemies from without.

The perversion of taste, which at the beginning of the seventeenth century reigned in Italy, and thence spread over all Europe, with much more rapidity indeed than the true poetry and pure style of the fifteenth century had done, created also in the literature of Poland a new period, which through the political cir-

dants by the female and collateral lines occupied the throne after Stephen Bathory. Poland had never been by law an hereditary kingdom; but in most cases one of the sons or brothers of the last king was elected.

⁶³ These *pacta conventa*, to which numerous articles were afterwards added, not only limited the king in his quality as king, but even also as a private man, in a degree to which no freeman would willingly submit. For example, he was not allowed to marry except with the consent of the diet; and as each single nuntius had the right to oppose and render void the resolutions of the united estates by his *liberum veto*, the king could not marry whenever it occurred to any one of them to withhold his consent. In 1689 it was resolved that no king should be allowed to abdicate.

circumstances above referred to, was protracted to a greater length than would have been expected in a literature already so rich in national models. To the remarkable activity of mind in the preceding period, there followed a literary lethargy. A very pernicious influence is also ascribed by the literary historians of Poland, to the Jesuits; although this order is in general disposed to favour the cultivation of science. Under Sigismund III, they were shrewd enough to make themselves gradually masters of nearly all the colleges, and after a long and obstinate struggle, even the university of Cracow had to submit. According to Bentkowski, it was principally by their influence, that the tone of panegyric and of bombast was introduced, which for nearly a hundred and fifty years disgraced the Polish literature. The tastelessness of this style reached its highest point under John Sobieski, when the panegyrics with which this victorious captain was hailed by his courtiers, became the model for all similar productions. The fashion first introduced at the close of the preceding period, of interspersing the Polish language with Latin words and phrases, became during the present more and more predominant; and was at length carried so far as to give even to Polish words a false Latin sound, by means of a Latin termination. French, German, and Italian forms of expression soon obtained the same right. But what was still worse, and what indeed affected the language most of all, was the fact, that even the natural structure and well established syntax of the Polish language had to give place to an injudicious imitation of foreign idioms. Thus the very circumstance of its great pliancy, one of its principal excellencies, became a source of its corruption. Poland, moreover, at a time when the minds of the rest of Europe were tolerably pacified in a religious respect, became the scene of theological controversies full of sophistry and bitterness, the natural consequence of the incipient oppression of the dissidents. The literature was overwhelmed with pamphlets, stuffed with a shallow scholastic erudition, and written in a style both bombastic and vulgar. But the influence of the Jesuits was not limited to literature and science; it had a still more unhappy result in its active consequences. Poland became also during this century the theatre of a religious persecution, less authorized by even the semblance of law than any which had before, or has since, occurred in other countries. The Arians or Unitarians, after having been for more than sixty years tacitly included in the general appellation of *dissidents*,

had to sustain between the years 1636 and 1658 the utmost rigour of oppression, and were finally banished from the country ; and all this without having done any thing to forfeit their rights as dissidents, from which body they had to be formally expelled by the united hatred of the other protestants and catholics, before even a pretext could be devised of proceeding lawfully against them. Nor had the Lutherans, Calvinists, Greeks and Armenians, who after the exclusion of the Unitarians, Quakers, and Anabaptists, were alone comprized under the name of dissidents, given any occasion for that gradual deprivation which they had to encounter of their lawful rights, in the possession of which they had been a hundred and fifty years undisturbed. The storm which threatened them, first manifested itself publicly in the diets of 1717 and 1718, and degenerated at last into open and shameless persecution. In the year 1724, a quarrel arose at Thorn on occasion of a procession of the Jesuits, between the students of one of their schools, and those of the Lutheran gymnasium. A Lutheran mob intermeddled and committed some excesses ; in consequence of which the Jesuit Wolanski, in the name of his order, instituted a lawsuit against the Lutheran magistracy of the city. The result of this lawsuit was a tragedy, such as only the bloody pages of the books of the inquisition can exhibit, and unequalled as to its motives in the annals of the eighteenth century. All the perpetrators were punished with the utmost rigour ; while Rösner, the president of the city, together with eleven citizens, were publicly beheaded, and their property confiscated for the benefit of the order.

A body, which acted in such a spirit, placed at the head of public education, could exert but a very injurious influence in a moral and religious respect ; its influence on the literature and language has been described above. The general mental paralysis and lethargy which reigned in Poland during this period, can indeed hardly be ascribed solely to their influence ; but the latter served greatly to increase it. For more than twenty years, all the schools in the whole country were in the hands of the Jesuits ; and when in the year 1642 the congregation of the ~~Piarists~~ ^{Piarists} erected their first school in Warsaw, which soon was followed by several others founded by the same order, these seminaries had to struggle for nearly a century, watched and oppressed by the jealousy and despotism of the Jesuits, before they could acquire any influence consistent with the spirit in which they were founded. To the talents and firmness of Stanislaus

Konarski, himself a Piarist, the Polish literary historians ascribe the principal merits of the final victory of his order. His endeavours indeed were favoured by a combination of fortunate circumstances. Literature and the fine arts found a friend and protector in a gifted and accomplished king, and in several high minded noblemen of even more than regal authority. But the period of pedantry, perversion of taste, and deficiency of true criticism, had already lasted more than a hundred and thirty years. There was much to be done to cleanse the beds in the garden of literature from all the weeds which had luxuriated there, and to fertilize a soil which had so long lain fallow. The details of these endeavours belong however to the following period.

To the character of the theological literature of this age, we have above alluded. Among the protestant writers were Andrew and Adalbert Wengierski. The works of the latter gave occasion to the polemical discussions of the Jesuit Poszakowski, himself the author of a history of the Lutheran and of the Calvinistic creed, and of several other books. Other works on subjects of theology and education, or collections of sermons and devotional exercises, were published by the Jesuits Szczaniecki, Koialowicz, Sapecki, Poninski, Zulkiewski and others; and the Piarists Gutowski, Wysocki, Rosolecki and others. The Jesuit Niesiecki wrote a comprehensive biblio-biographical work of great merit. which is considered as one of the best sources for the inquirer in Polish history and literature.⁶⁴ Another Jesuit, Wiliuk Koialowicz, translated Tacitus' Annals into Polish, and wrote in Latin a history of Lithuania. Knapski, also a Jesuit, published a large dictionary or "Thesaurus," which is still highly esteemed. Lubienski, archbishop of Gnesen, wrote in 1740 the first detailed geography in the Polish language. One of the most productive writers on various subjects of theology, history, and politics, was Starowolski, who died in 1656. Fourteen of his forty-seven works are written in Polish, the rest in Latin. We mention further, as geographical and historical writers of some merit, the piarist Kola, professor Saltszewicz, Chodkiewicz, Niemir and Chwalkowski; and as a distinguished mathematician and scholar of general information, Broscius.

We conclude this period with the poets of that age; who, although perhaps they exhibited more talent than the cotemporary prose writers, must necessarily, from the nature of poetry,

⁶⁴ *Korona Polska, Lemberg 1728, 1743.*

have suffered more from the predominant tastelessness of the time. Twardowski, d. 1660, must be named first; a poet of splendid gifts, but of an impure, bombastic, rhetorical style, the author of numerous lyrical and epic poems of very unequal value. After him come Vespasian Kochowski, the best lyric poet of the age; Gawinski, a very productive author, whose pastorals have been collected by Mostowski, together with those of Kochanowski, Simonides, and other classical poets; and Wenceslaus Potocki, the author of novels, poetry, and more especially epigrams, not without merit, but frequently licentious and indelicate. Among the poets of this age who are in some measure distinguished by Polish critics, we find also a lady, Elizabeth Drużbacka, a poetess of high rank, but without a literary education or a knowledge of foreign languages, though not without natural gifts. Satires were written by Dawonowski and Opalinski; historical and didactic poems by Bialabocki, prince Jablonowski, and by Leszczynski, father of king Stanislaus Leszczynski. Ovid was translated by Żebrowski and Otfinowski; Lucan's *Pharsalia* by Chroscinski, who versified also portions of the Bible; and again with more fidelity and skill by the Dominican monk Bardzinski. Other poets of this age were, prince Lubomirski, who on account of his wealth and wise sayings is styled the Polish Solomon; prince Wisniowiecki, who published whole poems without the letter *r*, because he could not pronounce that letter; Bratkowski, the author of a series of happy epigrams; Falibogowski, Szymonowski, the Jesuits Ignies and Poniatowski, and others.

FIFTH PERIOD.

From Stephen Konarski, A. D. 1760, to the present time.

The Polish language, at the beginning of this period, was in a melancholy state; it was, to use Schaffarik's expression, stripped of its natural gifts of perspicuity, simplicity, and strength, deformed by tastelessness, and grown childish and obsolete at the same time. It was a fortunate circumstance that, just at the time when several of the most powerful Polish noblemen began to feel an intense and patriotic interest in their language,—the king Stanislaus Augustus and his uncle prince Czartoryski at their head,—there awoke a number of gifted minds, who scattered so rich a seed in the long deserted though still fertile soil.

that the field of Polish literature soon flourished and bore fruit again. The establishment of the *Monitor*, a periodical work,⁸⁵ to which the best and ablest men of Poland contributed, first exerted a happy influence on the language. Of still more importance in this respect was the establishment of a national stage, at the head of which were distinguished and well qualified men. But the measure which produced more effect than any other, was the appointment of a Department of Education, resolved upon by the diet of 1775. Public instruction was thus made one of the great concerns of the government itself; and the power of the Jesuits, which had been for some time on the decline, was finally annihilated. The rich income of this order was henceforth entirely set apart for the benefit of learned institutions, to which free access was given. The provincial or departmental schools throughout the whole kingdom received a new organization on a different plan; and the university of Cracow resumed again its former rights. In respect to the instruction and melioration of the situation of the common people, we find as yet no attention whatever paid to these important subjects. It was not until 1807, or the foundation of the duchy of Warsaw under the administration of the king of Saxony, that the lower classes obtained their rights as men; and unfortunately even then without the power of availing themselves of these rights. Stanislaus Augustus, however, and some of his advisers and counsellors, acted with an honest will and noble intention; and by promoting the general interests of mankind in literature and science, did much for the social improvement of their own country.

Meanwhile this unhappy country was the scene of the most violent party struggles; during which the heads of the parties conducted themselves with the most revolting selfishness, and an entire forgetfulness of all political consequences and of their own moral responsibility. The fanaticism of the bishops of Cracow and Warsaw refused to the dissidents the restoration of their rights; and Russia thus acquired the first pretext for intermeddling with Polish affairs. In the course of a few years, Poland was reduced to that torn and broken state, which induced Catherine II to consider it as a country "where one needed only to stoop, in order to pick up something." For a short time this course of things even seemed to be favourable to literature.

⁸⁵ In 1764; it was the first periodical ever published in Poland.

The minds of men were in a state of excitement, which gave them power to produce the greatest and most extraordinary things. But a reaction very naturally followed. After twenty years of mental and political struggles and combats, to sustain which claimed the whole united powers of mind and soul,—twenty years richly productive in every respect—there followed a mental calm, an intellectual blank, of more than twelve years. It was, as if with the political dissolution of the kingdom, with the annihilation of the unity of the nation, this latter had sunk back into a state of intellectual paralysis. The interval from A. D. 1795 to A. D. 1807, in comparison with the years which preceded and have followed, was remarkably poor in productions of value. The literature of translations rose in an undue proportion, and the purity of the language suffered considerably. The government of the duchy of Warsaw acted on wise and truly humane principles; and during the short period between 1807 and 1812, all was done for the improvement of the country, which the unfortunate circumstances of the case permitted. Under this administration the number of schools rose from 140 to 634; a commission was instituted for procuring the publication of appropriate books of instruction in the Polish language; and several similar measures were taken for advancing the best interests of the country. The constitution of the new kingdom of Poland in 1815, entered essentially into the same views; and was in every respect favourable to the developement of the mental faculties of the nation. The modern kingdom of Poland embraced, indeed, not much more than the sixth part of the vast territory which under the Jagellons had constituted the kingdom of that name. Before the cessions at Andrussov in the year 1667, the ancient kingdom contained sixteen millions of inhabitants; the census of the modern kingdom in 1818, counted only 2,734,000. But that the population of this exhausted country increased during the Russian administration,—especially in consequence of the encouragement given to foreign colonists, the establishment of manufactures which furnished means of support for the lower classes, and other similar measures,—is apparent from the results of the census of 1827, according to which the kingdom then contained 3,705,000 inhabitants.⁸⁶

In the field of science and literature the nobility had at length found rivals among the free citizens; and the courts of these temples were now, through the erection of village schools, made

⁸⁶ See page 475 above.

accessible even to the peasant, who was, in name at least, no longer a degraded slave.⁸⁷ If the Russian government in Poland had been exercised in practice, according to the same principles on which it was founded; if Alexander's first intentions had been practically executed in the same spirit in which the happiness of his Polish subjects had been theoretically planned; perhaps it would have been less difficult to reconcile the minds of the Poles to the loss of their independence as a nation, which they justly consider as an inestimable good. We have here no concern with politics, except so far as they have a necessary influence on the state of general cultivation; or so far as they give birth to important occasional appearances in the republic of letters. If considered in the first point of view, it is not to be denied, that the Polish nation since the foundation of the *constitutional* Russian kingdom of Poland in 1815, has made more progress towards social improvement, and has advanced more towards a state of equality in a mental and intellectual respect with the countries of middle Europe, viz. Germany, France and England, than during the whole vast period of their previous existence. For most of these improvements, however, the preparation had already been made, in the last ten years before the dissolution of the republic. The emancipation of the serfs, who comprised the whole peasantry, one of the fundamental laws of the duchy of Warsaw in 1807, was confirmed at the creation of the kingdom of Poland in 1815. In the diet of the kingdom,

⁸⁷ The Polish serfs were indeed never regular slaves; but merely *glebae adscripti*, i. e. they could not be sold separately as mere things, but only with the soil they cultivated, which they had no right to leave. They were not reduced even to this state before the fifteenth or sixteenth century; for one of the statutes of Casimir the Great allows them the privilege of selling their property and leaving whenever they were ill-treated. Of the present state of the Polish peasantry, the author of "Poland under the dominion of Russia," (Bost. 1834,) says: "The Polish peasant might perhaps be about as free, as my dog was in Warsaw; for I certainly should not have prevented the animal from learning, had he been so inclined, some tricks by which he could earn the reward of an extra bone. The freedom of the wretched Polish serfs is much the same as the freedom of their cattle; for they are brought up with as little of human cultivation," etc. p. 165. And again: "The Polish serf is in every part of the country extremely poor, and of all the living creatures I have met with in this world, or seen described in books of natural history, he is the most wretched." p. 176.

not only the nobility and the government, but also the cities and smaller communities had their own representatives; and all christian denominations acquired equal political rights. To the universities of Cracow, Wilna, and Lemberg,⁸⁸ there was added in 1818 a fourth at Warsaw. The kingdom of Poland contained in 1827, in each of its eight waiwodships, a palatine school, and besides this three other institutions for the higher branches of education; fourteen principal department schools, and nine for sub-departments; several professional seminaries for miners, teachers, agriculturists, and others; a military academy, a school for cadets, and a number of elementary schools, both private and public.⁸⁹ The Russian-Polish provinces, i. e. the part of Poland united with Russia in the three successive dismemberments of Poland, participate in all the means of education which the Russian empire affords; the province of West Prussia and the grand duchy of Posen, in those of the kingdom of Prussia, where an enlightened government has made, as is generally acknowledged, the mental improvement of the lower classes one of its principal objects. The Austrian kingdom of Galicia had in the year 1819 two lyceums, twelve gymnasiums, several

⁸⁸ Lemberg indeed can hardly be called a Polish university. All its professors are Germans, and the lectures are delivered in Latin or German. It has only three faculties, viz. the philosophical, theological and juridical. For medicine it has only a preparatory school, the course being finished at Vienna. Among the 65 medical students of 1832, there were 41 Jews. The university had in that year, in all, 1291 students. For the theological and juridical courses, which, according to law, comprise each four years, a previous preparation of two years spent in philosophical studies is required by the government. Thus the regular course of an Austrian student lasts six years. The same measures were taken to Germanize Cracow, during the Austrian administration; but when in 1815 Cracow became a free city, it parted with all its German professors and became again a genuine Polish university.

⁸⁹ From the account given of the state of the Polish common people in note 87 above, we must conclude that this number is very small. Mr Ljach Szyrma, the author of *Letters on Poland*, (Edinb. 1823,) says: "The lower classes, unfortunately, do not enjoy the advantage of being proportionally benefited by the learning requisite to their social condition. The parish schools are not sufficient to improve them in this respect; and the village schools, upon which their hopes chiefly rest, are not numerous." p. 144.

other institutions for education of different names and for specific purposes, and also numerous elementary schools. The catholic religion is here the only reigning one; although the protestants, who here are still comprised under the name of dissidents, are tolerated.

The literary activity of the Polish nation occupied in 1827 not less than sixty printing offices and twenty booksellers. Of the latter fifteen were in Warsaw, the rest scattered over all the province formerly belonging to Poland. At Warsaw alone, five daily political papers, and one weekly, were published in the Polish language; besides these there existed only five, viz. one in each of the four larger cities, Cracow, Lemberg, Wilna, and Posen, and a fifth at St. Petersburg. There are other periodicals for scientific objects published at Warsaw; while in the other cities the German publications of that character are chiefly read. The periodical published by the national institution, called after count Ossolinski, at Lemberg, is however considered as the most important in the Polish language.

The high spirit of the Polish nation, and that glowing patriotism for which they are so distinguished, has induced them during the period of their unnatural partition and amalgamation with foreign nations, to devote more zeal than ever to the sole national tie which still binds together the subjects of so many different powers—their language. There have been numerous learned societies founded, among which above all the society of the friends of science at Warsaw, to whom the most eminent men of the nation belong, must be distinguished. Academies of arts and sciences have been established, and associations formed for various scientific purposes. The influence of all these institutions, more especially that of the above mentioned society at Warsaw, has been very favourably employed in limiting that of the French and German languages, naturally induced by political circumstances.

The French language indeed, independently of the political events of modern times, had already acted powerfully on the Polish at the close of the preceding and the beginning of the present period. In poetry, the affected bombastic school of the Gongorists and Marinists had been supplanted throughout all Europe by the better taste of the cold, stiff, and formal French poets, whose defects it was much easier to imitate than their merits. For more than half a century the French language reigned with an uncontrolled and unlimited sovereignty over all

the literary world. But its most absolute dominion was in Poland. In the manners of the nobility of this country, French gracefulness and ease were, in a peculiar and interesting manner, blended with the daring heroism of the knight and the luxuriousness of the Asiatic despot. French refinement and French witticism covered the rudeness and revelry characteristic of the middle ages. French teachers and governesses had inundated the whole country, and a journey to France was among the requisite conditions of an accomplished education. The Polish writers—all of them belonging to the nobility—to whom from their youth the French language was equally familiar with their own, unconsciously disfigured the latter by Gallicisms; since French forms of expression seemed to be the best adapted for the expression of French thoughts and French philosophy. Long after the rest of literary Europe had shaken off the yoke, the Polish poets, although the genius of their rich, creative, and pliant language was decidedly opposed to such a slavery, continued to submit to French rules and laws, and do so partly still. But the different character of the language and of the nation, impresses nevertheless a very different stamp on the Polish poetical literature.

We begin the enumeration of the distinguished writers of this period with its principal founder, Stephen Konarski, who was born A. D. 1700 and died in 1773. In his seventeenth year he entered the order of Piarists, and became later a professor in the college of this congregation at Warsaw. After a long stay in Italy and France, he returned to Poland; accompanied king Stanislaus Leszczyński to Lorraine; but again returned to his country and founded several institutions for education in Warsaw, Wilna and Lemberg, on principles different from those of the Jesuits. In the year 1747 he went a third time to France, but returned after three years; and from that time devoted himself entirely to the literary and mental reform of his own country. Of his printed works, twenty-eight in number, fourteen are written in Polish. They embrace different topics in poetry, and a tragedy; but his principal merits lie in his writings on the subject of politics and education.⁹⁰ After him we name the illustrious philosopher Stanislaus Leszczyński. Most of

⁹⁰ His works, which have never been collected, are enumerated in Spokowski's History of Polish literature. Konarski was the first who ventured publicly to assail the *Liberum veto*.

his works, on politics and ethics, were written in French; in the Polish language he wrote, besides one or two other works, a history of the Old and New Testaments in verse.⁹¹ Zaluski, known more especially by the foundation of a large and celebrated library, in which he spent an immense fortune, and which he finally made over to his country,⁹² was the friend of king Stanislaus and of Konarski. In possession of an extraordinary amount of knowledge, and a very extensive erudition, which however he owed more to his remarkable memory than to any distinguished capacity, he wrote a large number of Latin and Polish books on literary and biographical subjects and on poetry; in all which the genius of the preceding period still reigns. Another nobleman of high rank who distinguished himself by his patriotism and erudition, was Wenceslaus Rzewuski, waiwode of Podolia, and contemporary with Zaluski, whom he surpassed however in critical taste and productive powers. His translation of the Psalms is highly esteemed. A still higher name as a patron of literature and the arts, is the uncle of king Stanislaus Augustus, prince Adam Czartoryski. He was marshal of the diet in 1764, when the ill famed *liberum veto* was abolished, which gave to every deputy singly the right of overthrowing the otherwise unanimous resolutions of the diet, and thus was the principal cause of the lawless disorder which disgraced the sessions of this body. His merits as a statesman and a Mécenas, are equal. Several historical works designed to advance the honour of Poland, were published under his care and at his instigation. Amid all his numerous avocations, he found time to write several pieces for the national stage, which, as a promoter of the purity of the language, was a subject of his particular care and attention.⁹³ By the side of the name of Czartoryski, shines that of Potocki. More than one member of this illustrious family had in former times ac-

⁹¹ Nancy 1733.

⁹² This celebrated library was transferred to St. Petersburg at the dismemberment of Poland, and has not yet been restored.

⁹³ The Czartoryskis may justly be called the Polish Medici, from the liberal patronage which the accomplished members of this family have ever given to talent and literary merit. Their celebrated seat, Pulawi, the subject of many songs and also of an episode in Derville's *Jardins*, was destroyed by the Russians in the late war, and its literary treasures are said to have been carried to St. Petersburg.

quired the right of citizens in the republic of letters. Count Paul Potocki and his grandson Anthony, in the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century, were both equally celebrated for their talents. The works of the former were published by count Zaluski, under the title of *Genealogia Potockiana*; the speeches and addresses of the latter, are partly printed in Daneykowicz' *Suada Polona*, and were in their time considered as models. But the most elevated rank in this family is occupied by the two brothers Ignatius and Stanislaus Kostka Potocki, whether as patriots and statesmen, or as writers and patrons of science. Ignatius, besides promoting several literary undertakings, and bearing the expenses of more than one journey for the purposes of science and learning, was himself a distinguished writer. He translated Condillac's work on logic, and introduced it into the Polish schools as a class book. His merits in respect to public education are great; he was one of the most urgent promoters of the emancipation of the serfs; and at his death in the year 1809, he left behind the reputation of a true friend of the people. His brother Stanislaus Kostka, although entertaining the same political principles, did not take the same active part during the struggles of the Poles for their expiring independence; he retired to Austria after the king had joined the confederation of Targowicz, and there devoted himself entirely to his studies. In 1807 he returned to his country, and there as president of the department for schools and education, he found means to carry out his enlightened views and benevolent intentions for the good of his country. At the foundation of the kingdom of Poland in 1815, he was made minister of public instruction, and was always found at the head of every noble and patriotic undertaking. From his oratorical powers, he was called *princeps eloquentiae*. In respect to genius he was above his brother; although the latter seems to have surpassed him in energy of character. His principal work, "on Style and Eloquence," was published in 1815; another work of value is his translation of Winkelmann's book on ancient art, which he accompanied by illustrations and remarks, but did not finish. His influence on Polish literature was decided.⁹⁴ Another nobleman, distinguish-

⁹⁴ The title of the former work is: *O wymowie i stylu*, Warsaw 1815—16. Another work is *Pochwały, mowy i rozprawy*, i. e. Eulogies, Speeches and Essays, among which are nine on Polish literature, Warsaw 1816. Stanislaus Potocki was also the principal

ed as an orator and political writer, was Hugo Kollantay, count Sztumberg, who published together with Ignatius Potocki a history of the constitution.

At the head of the historical writers of Poland stands however Naruszewicz, the faithful translator of Tacitus, whose style he adopted also in his original works. His history of the Polish nation is considered as a standard work ; as a production, which in respect to erudition, philosophical conception, and style, is the *chef d'œuvre* of Polish literature, and would be one of the chief ornaments of that of every nation. The six volumes of this work comprise only the period between A. D. 965 and 1386, beginning with the second volume ; as for the first, which ~~was to~~ have contained the earliest history of Poland, he intended to have executed it afterwards, and had indeed collected all the necessary materials, but was prevented by death. The Warsaw Society of Friends of Science published it thirty years after his death, and endeavoured to engage the principal talents of Poland in the continuation of his work. This was done in such a way, that each writer was to undertake the history of the administration of a single king ; and at last, after each work had appeared separately, the society was to make a collection of the whole, and, if necessary, cause it to be rewritten. Several able men have devoted themselves to this work. The plan of the society, which by its very nature excluded all unity of character, seems to have met with more approbation than, according to our opinion, it deserved. The Polish public is however indebted to it for more than one valuable work on history, to which it gave birth. Naruszewicz had collected for this work a library of materials, in 360 folio volumes. He wrote also a history of the Tartars, a biography of the Lithuanian captain Chodkiewicz, and was admired as a poet. He died in 1796, it is said of grief at the fate of his unhappy country.

Naruszewicz was educated by the Jesuits, and was himself of that order until its dissolution. He died as bishop of Luck. In respect to time he stands as the first eminent writer of a new period, just on the verge of the past ; and even his warmest admirers do not deny that he participated, in some slight degree, in the

mover in the publication of the splendid work : *Monumenta regum Poloniae Cracoviensia*, Warsaw 1822. Stanislaus Kostka P. must not be confounded with Stanislaus Felix P. his cousin, one of the most obstinate advocates of the ancient constitution and its corruptions, who sold his country to Russia.

character of that past, by a certain inclination to panegyric and a flowery style. But in energy and richness of thought he far surpasses all his predecessors, and has not yet been reached by any who have written after him.⁹⁵

Another historical work of value on Poland, was edited by Lelewel. The history of Poland by Waga, in the want of a more suitable work, had been in use as a class book in the Polish schools for more than fifty years. Lelewel, in order to improve its popularity, took this book as a foundation, but completely recast it, divided the history of Poland according to a plan perfectly new, completed the work, and published it under Waga's name. His rich additions regard chiefly the legislature, statistics, and the cultivation of the country. His very division of the history of Poland, into Poland conquering, Poland divided, Poland flourishing, and Poland on the decline, seems to indicate the political tendency of his work, and his desire to impress upon the Polish youth the great moral lessons which history presents.

Another history of Poland of more extent was published by Bantkie. Lelewel said of the second edition of this book, which appeared in 1820, that "a more perfect work in this department did not exist."

One of the most remarkable writers of his time on history and bibliography, was the Jesuit Albertrandy, who besides being the author of several historical works and treatises, was indefatigable in collecting materials for the history of his country. He went to Italy, and here gathered during a stay of three years a hundred and ten folio volumes of extracts, entirely written with his own hand. He then went to Stockholm and Upsal, where the most important manuscripts relative to Poland are deposited. The Swedish government was narrow-minded enough, to allow him access to their libraries only on condition of his not taking any written notes. But Albertrandy had so remarkable a memory, that he was able to make up for this disadvantage, by writing down every evening all that he had read during the day, and added in this way not less than ninety folio volumes to his library of manuscripts.

⁹⁵ His complete works are to be found in the great collection of count Mostowski, Warsaw 1804—5, 12 volumes. They appeared in 1824 at Breslau in a stereotype edition, in six volumes. Poetical works, Wars. 1778.

Portions of Polish history or subjects belonging to it were treated with success by the poet Niemcewicz; by Bentkowski, Kwiatkowski, Soltykowicz, Surowiecki, Lelewel, Onacewicz, the counts Ossolinski and Czaki, the former distinguished by learning and critical discernment, the latter the author of an esteemed history of the Polish and Lithuanian laws; by Maiewski, Siarczynski, and others. The princess Isabella Czartoryski intended her "*Pilgrim of Dobromil*," to be a book of historical instruction for the common people. Abridgements of Polish history were given by Miklaszewski and Falenski. The historical songs written by Niemcewicz, at the instigation of the Warsaw Society of Friends of Science, are also to be considered as belonging to history, as well as to poetry, since they are accompanied by valuable historical illustrations. The same author wrote *Memoirs on ancient Poland*. Turski translated the memoirs of Choisain on the administration of Henry of Valois; and the memoirs of Michael Oginski, *Sur la Pologne et les Polonais depuis 1788 jusqu'en 1815*, are a valuable contribution to the history of our time. The modern periodicals likewise contain many well written historical essays, some of them of decided importance. This is especially true of the *Memoirs of Warsaw*, and also of *Lemberg*, the *Scientific Memoirs*, the *Wilna and Warsaw Journals*, the *Bee of Cracow*, the *Ant of Poznan*, and others.

We have remarked above, as a characteristic of the Polish literature, that although Poland has always been rich in talents of every description, yet its literary contributions have aimed less at the advancement of science in general, than to exalt the glory of the Polish name, and thus have an immediate reflexive influence on the nation. In the same spirit, the history of other countries has received little attention, not excepting even ancient history. Poland indeed does not possess a single distinguished work on foreign history; and their Gibbons and Robertsons seem ever to have been absorbed in their own patriotic interests. As writers of merit on universal history and its auxiliary branches, we may mention Cajetan and Vincent Skrzetuski, count John Potocki, Bohusz, Jodlowski, Sowinski, prince Sapieha, count Berkowski, and above all Lelewel, whose work on the discoveries of the Carthaginians and Greeks has been translated into German, (A. D. 1832,) accompanied by an introduction from the celebrated Ritter.

The Polish language, the purity of which at the beginning of

the present period was an object of particular attention, has in our own century been the subject of numerous learned inquiries, some of which have added considerably to the light thrown in modern times by Slavic-German scholars upon the Slavic languages and Slavic history in general. Linde, besides several other philological and historical writings, has enriched Slavic literature with a comparative critical dictionary in six volumes, which is considered as one of the standard works of the language. Bantkie, the author of several historical and bibliographical works of great merit in the Polish, Latin, and German languages, has written a Polish grammar and Polish-German dictionary. Rakowiecki prepared a new edition of the *Jus Russorum*, introduced by a critical preface, and accompanied with many explanatory notes. We must however, take this occasion to remark, that the Polish critics in general, although perhaps in every other respect qualified as sagacious and impartial judges, are by no means infallible on subjects which have any relation to their own country. The glory and honour of their own nation are always with them the principal objects, to which not seldom the impartiality of a scientific inquirer, and even historical truth, is unscrupulously sacrificed. Maiewski wrote a book rich in ideas on the Slavi;* bibliographical works, and books on the literary history of Poland have been published by Chrominski, Sowinski, Juszynski, count Ossolinski, Szumski, and more especially by Bentkowski.⁹⁶ Count Stan. Potocki's works contain likewise a number of articles on Polish literature. In the previous periods, all bibliographical works were written in Latin.

The eminent talent of the Poles for eloquence, enjoyed, during the early part of this period and before the dissolution of the republic, the best possible opportunity for developement, among the intellectual struggles and combats occasioned by the political circumstances of the country and the discussion of new political theories. The constitutional diet of 1788—1791 exhibited a rich store of oratorical talent. The names of the Potockis, Sapieha, Czartoryski, Kollantay, Matuszewicz, Niemcewicz, Soltyk, Kiciński, and others, were known with distinction all over the world. The eloquence of the pulpit was of course

* *O Slavianach i ich pobratymcach*, Warsaw 1816.

⁹⁶ Bentkowski's *Historiya literatury Polsk.* Wars. 1814, contains a catalogue of all works published on Polish literature, to 1814; see Vol. I. p. 1—73.

much less cultivated in a nation which lives chiefly in politics. Lachowski, a Jesuit and court preacher of the last king, is by the Poles considered as a very distinguished preacher, although according to German judges he was shallow and voluble; and was surpassed by his cotemporary Wyrwicz, and above all by Karpowicz. Prażmowski, Jakubowski, Woronicz bishop of Warsaw, Szianawski, Szweykowski, Zacharyaszewicz, and others, are esteemed as powerful preachers.

Besides the oratorical powers and the historical productions of the Poles, the reputation of their modern literature rests chiefly on poetry. Although the Polish poets adhered longer to the strict rules of Boileau than the rest of Europe, and have only in the most recent times chosen better models in the Germans and English—without however having been able to free themselves entirely from their French chains—yet the national genius of their language has often conquered the artificial restraints of narrow rules and arbitrary laws. Naruscewicz, the celebrated historian, occupies also a distinguished rank as a poet. He translated Anacreon and some of Horace's odes; but wrote still more original pieces, odes, pastorals, epigrams, satires, and a tragedy entitled 'Guido.' The most distinguished poet under Stanislaus Augustus was Krasicki, bishop of Ermeland or Warmia, and later of Gnesen, the Polish Voltaire. His principal works are an epic under the title of *Woyna Chocińska*, or 'War of Chociu,' and three comic epics, one of which, *Monachomachia*, ridicules the monkish system and exhibits its absurdity in strong colours. He wrote this poem at the suggestion of Frederic the Great, to whose coterie of literary friends he belonged. His great heroic epic is considered by his countrymen as a standard work; while foreigners look at it as a valuable historical poem indeed, but as utterly deficient in true epic power and original invention. His smaller poems and prose writings are replete with wit and spirit; and as a prose writer he appears as one of the few who were not blind to the defects and follies of their countrymen. Of his translations we mention Ossian and Plutarch.⁹⁷ Trembecki, d. 1812, as a lyric poet, takes equal rank, according to some Polish critics, with Krasicki. His chief poem, *Zofiówka*, which has been

⁹⁷ Krasicki's complete works were published by Dmochowski, Warsaw 1803—4. A stereotype edition appeared at Breslau in 1824.

translated into French by La Garde, is of that descriptive, contemplative kind, which was fashionable in his day. Szymanowski, d. 1801, a writer of pastorals, is distinguished for delicacy and sweetness. As to the beauty of his diction his countrymen are the best judges; but as for the character and real poetical value of his productions, we doubt whether the sounder taste of our day would relish the whole species so highly as was done at a time, when the forms of society had reached the very summit of artificial perversion. A certain longing after nature and its purity was the necessary result of such a state of things; but even nature itself they were unable to see, except in an artificial light. The Polish productions of this species in the present period, savour strongly of the French school; whilst the pastorals of the sixteenth century hover in the midst between the bucolics of the ancients and the Italian and Spanish eclogues. There was the same decided influence of the French literature on Wengierski, who died in 1787; although less in respect to taste than to morals. Karpinski, also a writer of pastorals, approaches nearest the Greeks, and is on the whole a poet of uncommon talent. All his original writings bear a strong national stamp. His translation of Racine's *Athalie* is considered as a master piece, and his version of the Psalms has not been surpassed in any language. Another distinguished poet is Kniaźnin, remarkable for a certain external freshness, which imports life to all his productions. He was educated in the college of the Jesuits at Witebsk, and it was during his whole life a matter of regret to him that he "had lost the golden season of his youth, and wasted the labour of sleepless nights on irksome trifles." Notwithstanding this learned education, the author of the *Letters on Poland* finds between him and Burns a kind of analogy. Kniaźnin's principal fame rests on a ludicrous heroic called the 'Balloon.'

The following are further regarded among their countrymen as poets of the first rank, viz. Niemcewicz, Brodzinski, bishop Woronicz, and Mickiewicz. Niemcewicz is also known by his political fortunes and influence, and is equally esteemed as an historian and for his poetical talents. The eloquence which he exhibited in the diet of 1788—92, as the *nuntius* or deputy of Lithuania, laid the foundation of his fame. When his country was lost, after having fought at the side of Kosciuszko and shared his fate as a prisoner, he accompanied this great man to America, where he associated with Washington, whose life he has

since described. His eulogy on Kosciuszko is considered as a masterpiece. His principal works are his historical songs, his dramas, and his "Reign of Sigismund III." Whatever he writes evinces eminent talents; as to which his friends only deplore that he has scattered them so much, or, according to the expression of the author of the *Letters on Poland*, that "his genius was too eager in embracing at once so much within its potent grasp, and thus, instead of concentrating his powers, lessened their brilliant beams, by diffusing them over too wide a horizon."⁹⁸

John Woronicz, bishop of Cracow, and afterwards of Warsaw, whom we have named above as one of the most eloquent preachers, is equally celebrated as a poet. His productions all have a character of dignity and loftiness, and, with the exception of some religious hymns, are devoted to the historical fame of his country. His "Sybil," in which he conjures up in succession the ancient Polish kings from their graves to behold the cruel state of their once triumphant country, and the "Lechiade," an epic, which Schaffarik considers as the best Polish production of this species, are his principal works. The inclination of the Polish poets to celebrate and exalt their own country and the heroic deeds of their ancestors, without even admitting the possibility of rivalry on the part of any other nation, can easily be accounted for; while to foreign critics, the same poems which inspire Polish readers with patriotic enthusiasm, often appear pompous and void of that simplicity, which is the true source of the sublime.

Casimir Brodzinski is an eminent original poet, and an admirable translator. His poetry is pervaded by a character of

⁹⁸ P. 221. Niemcewicz's works have not yet been collected. Of his *Spiewy historyczne*, or 'Historical Songs,' Warsaw 1819, Bowring gives some specimens. These songs were set to music by distinguished Polish composers, especially ladies, and on account of their deep patriotic interest, have reached a higher degree of popularity than any other Polish work. They were written at the instigation of the Warsaw "Society of Friends of Science." Besides his two historical works, *Dzieje panowania Zygmunta III.*, or *Reign of Sigismund III.*, Warsaw 1819, and *Zbior pamietnikow*, etc. a collection of unprinted documents, Wars. 1822; and his large historical novel *Jan z Teczny*, Wars. 1825; Niemcewicz published *Leyba i Szora*, or *Letters of Polish Jews*, Wars. 1821, presenting a good illustration of their situation. His most recent production, an elegiac poem, was published at Leipzig 1832. See below.

strong and decided nationality, and Bowring says of him: "If any man can be considered the representative of Polish feelings, and as having transfused them into his productions, Brodzinski is certainly the man." He has translated Ossian, and first introduced Scott's masterpieces into the literature of Poland.

Mickiewicz is the youngest of the Polish writers of celebrity, and owes his reputation as a poet of eminent talent chiefly to three small volumes of miscellaneous poetry, first published about ten years ago. To these a fourth was added in 1833, in which were deposited the riper productions of his manhood; whilst the earlier ones contained the beautiful effusions of his youthful feelings.⁹⁹

But the series of Polish poets who have manifested more than common talent, is too long to permit us to enumerate them all; and even a complete catalogue of their names must not be expected in these pages, which are devoted merely to a historical view of the *whole* literature, and to individuals only so far as they go to form characteristic features of the physiognomy of the former. The "Dictionary of Polish poets," published in 1820 by Juszynski, describes the lives of not less than 1400 individuals, independently of course of their poetical worth. We confine ourselves to presenting some of the most distinguished names in addition to those above-mentioned, viz. Gurski, a very productive and popular writer; L. Osinski, still more esteemed as a critic; Molski, Tanski, Boncza Tomaszewski, Okraszewski, Tymowski, Szydlowski, and Kozmian, the author of a popular didactic poem.

Polish literature is particularly rich in excellent translations. This is due partly to the richness and pliability of the language itself. Dmochowski, Przybylski, and Staszyc, translated Homer; and the two first, also Virgil. Dmochowski's translations are in rhymed verse; those of Przybylski, who also enriched Polish literature with translations of the *Paradise Lost*, the *Lusiad*, and of many other poems, are in the measures of the originals, and manifest both a profound knowledge of the foreign languages and great dexterity in using his own. Staszyc has written valuable works on various subjects, and enjoys a high esteem as a literary man and patriot. Felinski, the translator of Delille and Racine, is considered as the most harmonious Polish versi-

⁹⁹ The fourth volume appeared at Paris; where also his earlier poetry was reprinted in 1828 under the title: *Poezye Adama Mickiewicza*.

fer. Hodani, Osinski, Kicinski, Kruszyński, have likewise transplanted the productions of the French Parnassus into the Polish soil; Sienkiewicz, Odyniec, Mickiewicz, and others have devoted their talents to the English. Okraszewski translated the Greek tragic poets. Minasowicz, the author of fifty-three various works, and Nagurczewski, translated also several of the ancient authors, but according to the best critics with more knowledge of the classic languages, than skill in the management of their own. Among all the distinguished poets mentioned above, there is hardly one, who besides his original productions, did not likewise devote his talents to poetical translations; in which Karpinski, Naruszewicz, and Krasicki, succeeded to admiration.

In the whole domain of poetry, there is no branch in which the Poles less succeeded, or at least have manifested a greater want of *original* power, than the dramatic. Here the influence of the French school was most decided, and indeed exclusive. We have seen above what pains were taken by the most distinguished men of the nation, to establish a national stage; to which they looked, not in the light of a frivolous amusement, but as a school for purifying and elevating the national language and literary taste, and also as a means of correcting vice by ridiculing it. In this view several clergymen wrote for the theatre. The Jesuit Bohomolec wrote the first original comedies, in 1757; other comedies, valuable as pictures of the time, were written by bishop Kossakowski. Prince Czartoryski we have mentioned above as a writer of dramas. Zablocki, Lipinski, Osinski, Kowalski and others transplanted the French masterpieces to the Polish stage, or imitated them. The actors Boguslawski, Bielawski, and Zolkowski, wrote original pieces. Tragedies, mostly on subjects of Polish history, were written by Niemcewicz, Felinski, Dembowski, Slowacki, Kropinski, Hofmann, and F. Wenzky, whose "Gliniski" is considered as the best Polish production of this kind. The most popular comedies in recent times are by count Fredro, who is called the Polish Molière. The Polish stage is still richer in melo-dramas, especially rural pictures in a dramatic form; of which Niemcewicz's piece "John Kochanowski" is a fine specimen.

As it respects novels, tales in prose, and similar productions, the literature of Poland has been much less overwhelmed with this species of writing, in which mediocrity is so easy and perfection so rare, than that of their neighbours the Russians. We think this can easily be accounted for. They possess few, for

the same reason that the English are so rich in them. Domestic life, the true basis of the modern novel, has no charms in Poland. The whole tendency of the nation is towards public life, splendour, military fame; theirs are not the modest virtues of private retirement, but the heroic deeds of public renown. The beauty, the spirit, the influence of their women, is generally acknowledged; but that female reserve and delicacy which draws the thread of an English novel through three volumes, would be looked for in vain in Poland. Niemcewicz however published in 1827 an historical novel, "John of Tenczyn," which is considered as a happy imitation of Scott. Others were written by count Skarbeck. Among the novels, which present a psychological development of character and a description of fashionable life, "The Intimations of the Heart" is considered as the principal work. It was written by the princess of Wirtemberg, daughter of Adam and Isabella Czartoryski. Another highly esteemed female writer is Clementina Hofmann, formerly Tanska. The Poles, although from a feeling of pride and patriotism naturally disposed to overrate the productions of their own literature, are far from being deficient in critical judgment or in exalted ideas on the theory of the beautiful. The counts Stan, Potocki and Ossolinski, L. Osinski, Golanski, and others, maintain a high rank in this department.

Philosophy, as an abstract science, independently of its immediate application to subjects of real life, has never found more than a few votaries among the Poles. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, Aristotle was translated into Polish by Petryci. For nearly two hundred years, the teachers of philosophy in the Polish universities stopped at Aristotle; and a few commentaries on his Ethics and Politics composed the whole philosophical literature of Poland. In the first years of our own century, Jaronski and Sciasawski made an attempt to introduce the philosophy of Kant; but although the cause appeared to be in the best hands, they met with little success. Galuchowski, a German philosophical writer of merit, is a Pole by birth.*

For the study of polite literature and the Slavic languages, Warsaw is the principal seat; for philology and the exact sciences, the university of Wilna. This learned institution has taken special pains in respect to the necessary elementary books for

* Author of the work: *Die Philosophie in ihrem Verhältnisse zum Leben ganzer Völker*, Erlangen 1822.

the study of the classical languages ; and is distinguished by its able professors Groddek, Bobrowski, and Zukowski. The former, a scholar of high reputation, in addition to several original philological works, has translated Buttman's Greek Grammar into Polish ; the latter has published also a Greek and a Hebrew Grammar. In the oriental languages Senkowski at St. Petersburg is distinguished ; and count Rzewuski at Vienna has great desert in connexion with the celebrated periodical work, *Fundgruben des Orients*.

In consequence of the grand-duke Constantine's predilection for mathematics, an undue share of attention, during the last fifteen years, has been paid in schools to the exact or empirical sciences ; *undue* we call it, because on account of its excess, the moral and literary pursuits of the pupils have necessarily been neglected. Mathematics, during this whole period, were taught by several eminent men ; by John Sniadecki, who is at the same time considered as a model in respect to style and language ; by Poczobut, Zaborowski, Czech, Rogalinski, and others. In the same departments the names of Twardowski, Polinski, and Konkowski, must be honourably mentioned. Count Sierakowski wrote a classical work on architecture ; and the learned Polish Jew Stern is celebrated over all Europe as the inventor of arithmetical and agricultural machines. Count Chodkiewicz and Andrew Sniadecki are distinguished chemists. Natural philosophy, although less studied, has able professors in H. Osinski and Bystrzycki ; natural history, more especially botany and zoology, in Kluk and Jundzill. Medicine, until the last seventy years, was in Poland exclusively in the hands of foreigners, especially Germans and French ;¹⁰⁰ since then several gifted Poles have devoted themselves to this science, although they have not yet formed a national school. Lafontaine, body physician of the last king, Dziarkowski, Perzyna, Malcz, and others, must be mentioned here. The university of Wilna is the most celebrated school for medical science.

¹⁰⁰ See Dr Connor's History of Poland, 1698. Even as late as the close of the seventeenth century, the Poles were barbarians enough to look upon the profession of a physician with contempt. They had however in earlier times some very celebrated physicians, as Martin of Olkusc, Felix of Lowicz, and Struthius, who was called to Spain to save the life of Philip II, and even to the Turkish sultan Soliman II.

Among the reflecting statesmen of Poland, there has recently been a great deal of attention bestowed on national economy and its various branches, more especially on studies connected with agriculture, as being the science most applicable to the present wants of the country. Poland being the most extensive plain in Europe, and for the most part of a very rich and fertile soil, the Poles would seem destined by nature to be an agricultural people. We cannot but observe here, that from this very circumstance, the wretched state of the labouring classes is placed in a still more striking light. The interests of agricultural science have been promoted by different societies, and several able treatises on those subjects have been published; although it does not appear that any new theory or principles have been started. Of all the branches of moral science, political economy has met in Poland with the most disciples. Valuable statistical works on Poland in the Polish language have been written by Staszyc, honourably mentioned above, by Sławiarski and others. Swiencki in his 'Geography of ancient Poland,' Surowiecki in his 'History of the Polish towns and peasantry,' give very valuable statistical notices; and the 'Journey to Constantinople and Troy' by count Raczyński, contains an exact statistical account of Podolia and the Ukraine.

The science of law must ever have been in a melancholy state in a country like Poland. Poland proper has always been governed by *statutes* and *constitutions*, sanctioned by the diet. These were either founded on ancient usages, *consuetudines*, or occasioned by particular circumstances. The towns were governed according to the code of Magdeburgh. In Lithuania the ancient Lithuanian statutes, collected in 1529, prevailed and still prevail, if not in collision with any intervening *ukase*.* In the other provinces, the laws of the respective monarchies to which they are annexed, are in force. Thus the different portions of Poland are governed in accordance with seven different systems of law.¹⁰¹ Under the administration of the last king of Poland, which was so rich in improvements, a general code of laws was also planned, and projects were prepared by able statesmen and lawyers; but they were all rejected by the diet of 1777. Under the Russian administration, preparation was made from the

* This code is frequently called the code of Leo Sapieha, the sub-chancellor of Lithuania, who in A. D. 1588 translated it from the White Russian into the Polish language.

¹⁰¹ See *Revue Encyclopédique*, Oct. 1827, p. 219.

very beginning for the introduction of a new code ; but the first project of a criminal code presented by the council of state, was likewise rejected by the diet of 1820. A portion of the civil code was accepted in A. D. 1825 ; but the complete code, which was ready for publication in the year 1830, has not, so far as we are informed, yet been introduced. The administration of justice in Poland is about as bad as in Russia ; being nothing but one great system of bribery and corruption. Of the judges of the lower courts, two thirds are elected ; one third of these and all the officers of the higher tribunals, are appointed by the government. In former times the profession of a lawyer, as well as that of a physician, was considered in Poland as degrading and unworthy of a nobleman. These two professions were not indeed prohibited by law, like that of traders—for a nobleman who retailed “by yards or by pints,” legally lost his rank—but custom had made all those occupations which were the source of pecuniary profit, equally the objects of contempt. There was even a time, “when it was reckoned a matter of indifference for a nobleman to *understand arithmetic*.”¹⁰² In modern times the ideas on this subject have of course changed ; the study of law is no longer despised, especially in its necessary connexion with the administration of justice. Slotwinski in Cracow, Brantkie and Maciejowski in Warsaw, are esteemed as teachers of law. The Roman law, both civil and criminal, is studied in the universities, as well as the law of nature and nations ; which latter, in the case of this unhappy country, has been for more than sixty years so cruelly violated.

It is a singular fact, that although, down to the year 1818 when the Russian government interfered to prevent it, foreign travel was one of the favourite means of education among the Polish nobility, their literature exhibits hardly any books of travels. A few were formerly written in Latin or French ; among the latter we mention John Potocki's ‘Travels for the purpose of discovering Slavic antiquities,’ Hamb. 1795. In more modern times count Raczynski, has published a ‘Journal of his travels to Constantinople and the plain of Troy,’ richly embellished with illustrations.¹⁰³ A view of Great Britain was given in 1828 by Ljach Szyrma, under the title : *Anglia i Szkocya*.

¹⁰² See Letters on Poland, p. 103.

¹⁰³ Breslau 1821. The same author published John Sobieski's

We have thus brought down the history of Polish literature to the year 1830, an epoch of glorious, although most melancholy moment in the history of Poland. To that time the survey which we have given, at the beginning of this period, must be chiefly applied. The state of the country, on the whole, was prosperous. The cruel wrongs inflicted on the Poles, were all in express violation of a constitution, which in 1815 met with the approbation of Kosciuszko and the best of the nation. A noble individual or a high-spirited people can more easily submit even to unjust laws, than to arbitrary despotism. *Legally* the grand duke had no right to keep a single Russian soldier in Poland; by the terms of the constitution they could be there only as foreign guests. *Legally* the press was free. *Legally* Poland could have defended herself by her charter against every arbitrary act of her sovereign or his viceroy. It would seem, however, that even the repeated infringements of the constitution, and the direct violation of the laws by the government, did not contribute so much to induce the Poles to insurrection, as the fierce and brutal behaviour of the Russian generalissimo, and of the Russian civil and military officers high and low, whose profligacy had long made them the objects of deep contempt. The annals of Warsaw indeed present, during the Russian administration, one of the most revolting pictures which history exhibits; and the idea that it owes its darkest shades principally to the reckless despotism of one individual, serves only to make them appear still darker.

The war, which called into exercise all the mental faculties of the nation, put a stop of course to all literary activity; but even during the more quiet period which has succeeded it—the quietness of a cemetery—the dejected spirits of the nation, whose noblest sons an interval of two years has rendered prisoners, exiles, or corpses, are easily to be perceived in the results of their intellectual pursuits. A small volume containing three poems by Niemcewicz and Mickiewicz, was printed in 1833 at Leipzig. It is the swan-like melody of the aged poet; whilst the younger celebrates the exploits of his valiant brethren. The late vice-president of Warsaw, Xavier Bronikowski, now publishes *Polnische Miscellen* in the German language at Nuremberg.* For

Letters, a work read throughout all Europe, in its French translation by count Plater and Salvandy.

* An association of literary gentlemen at Paris, mostly exiles from

the expression of all patriotic feelings, the Polish printing offices at home are of course shut up. The fifteen printing offices at Warsaw, nevertheless, during the interval between March and December in the year 1832, issued not less than sixty-three Polish works. The most important among this number is a History of the Slavic Legislatures, by Prof. Maciejowski. Schaffarik was expected to accompany it with a sketch of Slavic History and Geography, but was prevented by sickness and domestic affliction. Another, although more limited work, is an Exhibition of the Slavic rights of inheritance, by J. Hübner. Learned treatises of this kind were until recently wholly wanting in the Polish literature, and have long been a desideratum among Slavic scholars.

The publication of the early chronicles, intended to render them more accessible to the public, is continued. Idzkowski has published a valuable contribution to the history of the arts, in a Sketch of Architecture. The cholera has occasioned the appearance of several able medical works. The Society of Sciences at Cracow has given birth to more than one respectable historical essay; and has indeed acquired an important standing by the suppression of all other similar institutions. Cracow, after all, is at present the only purely Polish city, the only remaining weak, but venerable nursery of Polish liberty. A highly interesting work was recently published at this place, a 'History of the Latin language in Poland,' by Dr Macherzynski. This book is considered as a mine of erudition and useful knowledge. A list is annexed of all the different editions of the classics published in Poland. We learn from it that Cicero's works have been edited there, partly in portions and partly complete, not less than forty-five times, the first time as early as A. D. 1500, at Cracow; Horace, eight times, first in 1521; Ovid four times, first in 1529; Virgil six times, first in 1642, etc.

We conclude with a few remarks on the popular songs of the Polish nation. There has indeed been no previous opportunity for introducing them to the knowledge of the reader; since they have never exerted any influence on the other sections of poetical literature; nay, have been by the higher classes decidedly neglected. The Poles are however as rich in these treasures, as other Slavic nations, i. e. in those lyrical effusions of feeling,

Poland, have announced a work with the title: *Souvenirs de la Pologne historiques, statistiques et littéraires*. It is calculated to comprise about twelve volumes.

common to all of them; but we find here among the Poles no trace of epic poetry. The principal thing in the Polish popular songs is however the *tune* or melody; thus their celebrated national dances, Mazur, Kossak, and the incomparable Polonaise, are known and admired all over the world, whilst the words which originally accompanied those melodies, are forgotten even at home. Pensiveness is the fundamental tone of all their songs and melodies. Even the Mazur, originally a child of joy, melts frequently into plaintive strains. "These," says the author of a little collection of Polish songs recently published in Germany, "these are the after-pains of whole generations; these are the sorrows of whole centuries; which in these melodies are blended into one everlasting sigh!"¹⁰⁴ The original seat of most of these songs is the Ukraine; from whence they penetrated into Podolia and Volhynia. But Poland proper has also its popular songs; some of which are said to be derived from the fifteenth or sixteenth century; but they have changed too much, to afford any evidence of the state of the language at that time, and belong in their present state most certainly to a later period. The songs of Lithuania, where, as we have seen above, the mass of the people are of another race, do not belong here.

The extraordinary mental activity of the Polish nation promises soon to give to the history of their literature a still greater extent. May it be the will of divine Providence, that their noble poets shall ere long exult in the happiness of their country, in a state of independence; and that with theirs shall likewise be joined the voices of those oppressed classes, in whom not only the RIGHTS OF NATIONS have for sixty years been violated, but also for centuries the RIGHTS OF MAN!¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ *Volkslieder der Polen gesammelt und übersetzt von W. P.* Leipzig 1833. The only Polish collection of popular poetry we know, is the work *Sielanki Polske*, Warsaw 1778.

¹⁰⁵ The history of Polish literature has been treated at large in several valuable works. In the English language the *Letters on Poland*, Edinb. 1823, and Bowring's *Introduction to his Polish Anthology*, are, so far we are informed, the only books which contain literary notices of Poland. Latin works are: *Starowolski Scriptor. Polon. Hecatonstas*, Frankfort 1625. *Wengierski Systema hist. chron. eccles. Slavonicar.* Utrecht 1652, Amsterd. 1679. *Zaluski Bibliotheca poet. Polon.* Wars. 1752. *Polonia literata*, Bresl. 1750. *Acta literaria regni Polon.* Wars. 1756. *Janociana sive claror. Polon. auctorum Memoriae miscellae*, Warsaw 1776—79, 2 vols. Vol. 3, 1819. The titles of numerous other Latin works are to be found in *Bentkowski's Hist. lit.*

IV. Languages of the Sorabian-Vendes in Lusatia, and of other Vendish tribes now extinct.

The north-eastern part of Germany, as far west as the Elbe and Saale, was from the fifth to the tenth century almost exclusively inhabited by nations of the Slavic race. Various Teutonic tribes—among them the Burgundians, the Suevi, Heruli, and Hermunduri—had before this taken up their temporary residence along the Baltic, between the Vistula and the Elbe. In the great migration of the Asiatic-European nations, which for nearly two centuries kept in motion all Europe from the Icy Ocean to the Atlantic, and extended even to the north of Africa,

Pol. Vol. I. p. 1—73, and partly in Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Slav. Spr.* p. 478. German works are: Lengnich's *Poln. Bibliothek*, Danzig 1718. Janocki *Kritische Briefe*, Dresden 1745. *Nachrichten von raren Poln. Büchern*, Dresden 1747. *Poln. Büchersaal*, Breslau 1756. Mieler de Kolof *Warschauer Bibliothek*, Wars. 1754. Kausch's *Nachrichten über Polen*, Gratz 1793. Münnich's *Geschichte der Poln. Literatur*, 1823. In French: Duclou's *Essai sur l'histoire de la littérature de Pologne*, Berl. 1778. *Revue Encyclopédique*, Oct. 1827. The most popular Polish works are: Chrominski *O literaturze Polsk.* see *Annals of Wilna* 1806. Bentkowski *Historia literatury Polskiej*, Warsaw 1814. Count Ossolinski's *Wiadamosci historyczno-krytyczne do dzieiow literat. Polsk.* Cracow 1819. Juzzynski *Dykcjonarz poetow Polskich*, Cracow 1820. Szumski *Krotki rys hist. literat. Polsk.* 1824, etc.—In grammatical and lexical works the Polish language is very rich. The language having considerably changed, we name only the principal of the modern: GRAMMARS, in German, Krumholz *Polnische Grammatik*, Breslau 1797, 6th edit. *Auszug aus Kopczynski's Grammatik*, von Polsfuss, Breslau 1794. Mrongovius *Poln. Sprachlehre*, Königsb. 1794, and in several altered editions under different titles; last edition Danzig 1827. Szumski's *Poln. Gramm.* Posen 1830. Vater's *Grammatik der Poln. Sprache*, Halle 1807. Bantkie *Poln. Grammatik* attached to his Dictionary, Breslau 1808—1824. In French, Kopczynski *Essai d'une grammaire Polonoise*, Wars. 1807. Traubczynski *Grammatique raisonnée de la langue Polonoise*, Wars. new edit. 1793.—DICTIONARIES. The most useful are, Mrongovius *Handwörterbuch der Poln. Sprache*, latest edit. Danz. 1823. Troc *Franz-poln.-deutsches Wörterbuch*, in several editions from 1742 to 1821. J. V. Bantkie *Taschenwörterbuch der poln. Sprache*, (German and French,) Breslau and Wars. in several editions from 1805 to 1819.—Standard works for the language are the etymological dictionaries: G. S. Bantkie *Słownik dokładny iez. pol. i. niem.* Breslau 1806, and Linde's *Słownik iez. pol.* Wars. 1807—14. For other philological works, see Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Slav. Spr.* p. 410.

the warlike German nations moved towards the southwest, and Slavic tribes traversing the Danube and Vistula, in immense multitudes, took possession of the countries which they left. Those who came over the northern Vistula, settled along the coasts of the Baltic as far west as to the Elbe and Saale, and as far south as to the Erzgebirge (Ore Mountains) on the borders of Bohemia.

These Slavic tribes were called by the Germans, *Wenden*, Lat. *Venedi*, for which we prefer in English the form *Vendes*, rather than that of *Wends*. It appears indeed that this name was formerly applied by the Germans indiscriminately to all the Slavic nations with which they came in contact; for the name *Winden*, Eng. *Vindes*, which is still, as we have seen, the German appellation for the Slovenzi, or the Slavic inhabitants of Southern Germany, is evidently the same in a slightly altered form. The name of *Wenden*, *Vendes*, became however, in the course of time a specific appellation for the northern German-Slavic tribes, of which, at the present day, only a few meagre remnants are left. They were nevertheless once a powerful nation. Five independent branches must be distinguished among them.

We first name the *Obotrites*, the former inhabitants of the present duchies of Mecklenburg, and the adjacent country, west, north, and south. They were divided into the *Obotrites* proper, the *Wagrians* in Holstein, and the *Polabae* and *Linones* on the banks of the Elbe and Leine; but were united under a common chief or king. They and their eastern neighbours the *Wiltzi*, (Germ. *Wilzen*, Lat. *Veletabae*,) with whom they lived in perpetual warfare, were the most warlike and powerful among the Vendish tribes. The *Wiltzi* or *Pomeranians* lived interspersed with the *Kassubes*, a *Lekhish* tribe, between the Oder and the Vistula, and were subjugated by the *Obotrites* in A. D. 782. It was however only by the utmost exertions, that these latter could maintain their own independence against their western and southern neighbours, the Germans. Conquered by Charlemagne, they regained their independence under his successors, and centuries passed away in constant and bloody conflicts and alternate fortunes. In the middle of the twelfth century, however, they were completely subjugated by Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony and Bavaria. He laid waste their whole country, destroyed most of the people, and compelled the few remaining inhabitants and their prince, to accept Christianity from his bloody hands. In A. D. 1167 he restored to this latter,

whose name was Pribislaus, a part of his kingdom, and gave his daughter Matilda in marriage to the son of Pribislaus, who a few years later was made a prince of the empire, and was thus gained over to the German cause. His descendants are the present dukes of Mecklenburg; and it is a memorable fact, that these princes are at the present day the only sovereigns in Europe of the Slavic race. German priests and German colonists introduced the German language; although we find that Bruno, the chief missionary among the Obotrites, preached before them in their own language. The Slavic dialect spoken by them expired gradually; and probably without ever having been reduced to writing, except for the sake of curiosity when very near its extinction. The only documents of it which have come down to us, are a few incomplete vocabularies, compiled among the Polabae and Linones, i. e. the inhabitants adjacent to the Elbe, in Slavic *Labe*, and to the Leine, in Slavic *Linac*. Long after the whole region was perfectly Germanized, a few towns in the eastern corner of the present kingdom of Hanover, were still almost exclusively inhabited by a people of Slavic race, who in the seventeenth century, and even to the middle of the eighteenth, had preserved in some measure their language and habits. But, since the Germans were strongly prejudiced against the Vendish name—the nations of this race, especially those in the western part of the German territories, being despised as subjugated tribes and inferior in general knowledge and information—they gradually renounced their national peculiarities. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, when Hennings, German pastor at Wustrow, took great pains to collect among them historical notices and a vocabulary of their language, he found the youth already ignorant of the latter, and the old people almost ashamed of knowing it, or at least afraid of being laughed at by their children. They took his inquiries, and those of other intelligent persons, in respect to their ancient language and usages, as intended to ridicule them, and denied at first any knowledge of those matters. We find, however, that preaching in the Vendish language of this region was still continued for some time later. Divine service was held in it for the last time at Wustrow, in the year 1751. According to the vocabularies which Hennings and a few others collected, their dialect, like that spoken in Lower Lusatia, was nearly related to the Polish language, partaking however in some peculiarities of the Bohemian, and not without some of its own.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ Herder, in his *Volkslieder*, communicated a popular ballad from

The second great Vendish tribe, the Wiltzi or Pomeranians, (Germ. *Wiltzen*,) also called Veletabae, were, as we said above, subjugated in A. D. 782 by the Obotrites; and the country between the Oder and the Vistula formed for more than a hundred and fifty years a part of the great Vendish kingdom. They regained, however, even before the final dissolution of this latter in A. D. 1026, the partial independence of their own dukes; who attached themselves to Germany, and afterwards, under the name of the dukes of Pomerania, became princes of the empire. In the year 1124 the first Pomeranians were baptized by Otho, bishop of Bamberg; and the place where this act was performed, Ottosbrunnen, (Otho's Well,) which five hundred years ago was encircled by four lime trees, is still shown to the traveller. As they received religion and instruction from Germany, the influence of the German language can easily be accounted for. German colonists aided in spreading it throughout the whole country. The last person who understood the old Pomeranian language, is said to have died in the year 1404. No trace of it remains, excepting only the names of places and persons, the Slavic origin of which can be recognized throughout all north-eastern Germany by the terminations in *itz*, *enz*, *ik*, or *ow*. In A. D. 1637 the line of the old Pomeranian dukes expired, and the country fell to Brandenburg, with the exception of that part which Sweden usurped at the peace of Westphalia. The island of Rügen, which till A. D. 1478 had its own native princes, belonged to this latter. It is the principal seat of German-Slavic antiquities. The ancient Rugians and their gods are mentioned by Tacitus, and described by Saxo Grammaticus. The old chronicles and legends, founded on still older traditions, speak of a large and flourishing city named Vineta on the small island Wollin, south-east of Rügen, once the principal seat of the western Slavic commerce, and, as Herder calls it, the Slavic Amsterdam. This city is said by some to have been destroyed by the Danes; by others to have been engulfed in the sea by the sinking of the ground beneath it. Modern inquirers, however, have doubted whether it ever existed; and hard as it is to renounce the many poetical associations attached to such a subject—so similar to those which fill the mind in thinking of Pompeii and Herculaneum—their objections have not yet been satisfactorily refuted.

The third separate branch of the Vendish stem were the Ukri-

this dialect. See *Literatur und Kunst*, Vol. VII. p. 126. edit. of 1827—30.

ans, or Border-Vendes, Germ. *Ukern*, from *Ukraina*, border. They lived in the territory which afterwards became the margravate of Brandenburg, and were divided into several tribes, as the Hevelli on the banks of the Havel, the Retarians, etc. Their situation was such, that constant conflicts between them and the guardians or watch of the German frontiers, the Saxon margraves on the other side of the Elbe, were unavoidable. These served gradually to extend the German *marches* or frontiers further and further, until in the year 1134 Albert the Bear, count of Ascania, finally conquered the Vendes. The Slavic inhabitants of this region were cruelly and completely destroyed; the country was repopled by German and Dutch colonists, and given as a fief by the emperor to Albert the Bear, the first margrave of Brandenburg. Brandenburg was the German form for *Brannibor*, the most considerable of the Vendish cities, after which the country was called. The names of places, many of them altered in a similar manner, are indeed the only weak traces of the Vendish language once spoken in this part of Germany. No tribe of the Vendes seems to have been so completely extinguished; the present inhabitants of Brandenburg being of as pure a German origin, as those of any other part of Germany.

The descendants of only two Vendish tribes have preserved their language; and even these, from powerful nations spread over the surface of at least 4800 geographical square miles, have shrunk into the comparatively small number of about two hundred thousand individuals, now inhabitants of Upper and Lower Lusatia. Nearly all of them are peasants; for the higher classes, even if Slavic blood perhaps runs in their veins, are completely Germanized. These tribes are the Sorabians, Lat. *Sorabae*, Germ. *Sorben*, in Lusatia, divided into two different branches. Although in fact two distinct tribes, and speaking different dialects, yet their early history cannot well be separated. After the dissolution of the great kingdom of Thuringia by the Franks and Saxons in the year 1528, the Sorabians, or Sorbae, took possession of the countries left by the Hermunduri, viz. the territory between the Harz mountains, the Saale, and the Erzgebirge, and extended their dominion in a northern direction to the seats of their brethren, the Ukrians, and towards the east as far as to the region in which their near relations, the Lekhes, about the same time had settled. They made serfs of the German inhabitants whom they found scattered through this country, and according to their industrious habits, began immediately af-

ter their arrival to cultivate the soil, to build cities, and to trade in the productions of the country. Although not strictly a war-like people, they were able for several centuries to defend their frontiers against the frequent attacks of their German neighbours on the other side of the Saale, and to give them trouble in return. But they yielded before the arms of Charlemagne; and after a short interval of renewed independence, they were completely subjugated and made tributary by Henry I. Their country, according to the German custom, was divided into *marches*, and populated with German settlers. These latter more especially occupied the towns, and built villages among the woods and mountains; whilst the Vendes, chiefly addicted to agriculture, continued to occupy the plains. But even on the plains, there soon arose the castles of German knights, their masters and oppressors; and the Vendish population was by degrees reduced to the miserable condition of serfs.

In the year 968, the first attempt was made to convert them to Christianity, partly by the sword of the conqueror, partly by the instruction of christian missionaries. But more than one century passed away, before the christian religion was fully introduced among them. Benno, bishop of Meissen, who died in A. D. 1106, at the age of ninety-six, acquired by his activity in the work of converting the Vendes, the name of the apostle of the Slavi. The obstinate resistance with which the christian religion had been rejected by them, can easily be explained by the unjudicious, nay flagitious way, in which it was presented to them by the Germans; who came among them, the sword in one hand and the cross in the other; and exacted moreover from them the sacrifice of their language, their customs, their whole nationality in exchange. The naturally childlike, submissive disposition of the Slavi, rendered them in all other regions, as we have seen, willing to receive the christian doctrines, more especially when their superiors themselves acted as their apostles; as was in some measure the case with the Russian Vladimir, Jagello in Lithuania, etc.¹⁰⁷ But the mode described

¹⁰⁷ "On a certain day all the inhabitants of Kief were assembled on the banks of the Dnieper, and on a signal from the monarch, all plunged into the river, some to the waist, others to the neck; parents held their children in their arms while the ceremony was performed by the priests in attendance. Thus a nation received baptism, not only without murmuring, but with cheerfulness; for all were convinced that a religion, embraced by the sovereign and boyards, must necessarily be the best in the world." Foreign Quart. Review, Art. on Ka-

above, which was adopted by the German heroes, not only among the Vendes, but also some centuries later among the old Borussians, could not but rouse all their feelings of pride and nationality to a decided resistance. Even when the Germans refrained from force, their means of conversion were equally opposed to the spirit of Christianity. Bishop Otho of Bamberg, for instance, was accustomed, when on his missionary travels, to have fifty or more wagons in his train loaded with cloth, victuals, etc. in order to reward on the spot those who submitted to baptism.¹⁰⁸

But the holy light of Christianity, even after the Vendish tribes had embraced its doctrines, did not clear up the darkness of their fate. The whole humiliating relation between masters and serfs in Germany, which still degraded the last century, was unknown to the free ancient Germans, among whom only the prisoner of war was a slave; and is derived from the period of the submission of the Vendes. The Germans indeed seem to have considered them as an inferior race, and treated them accordingly. The contempt with which the old historians speak of them, is revolting to every liberal and unprejudiced mind, and can hardly be explained. For the Sorabians were at the time of their submission, superior on the whole to the Germans in respect to civilization, although in consequence of this contemptuous treatment they in the course of time fell far behind them. Despised and oppressed, they were kept for centuries in a state of ignorance and neglect; from which, it seems, they could only escape by renouncing their Slavic peculiarities, and above all their language. The use of this latter before courts of justice was in the fourteenth century forbidden by law throughout most of the country. In the beginning of the same century, the Vendish language was still sometimes heard at Leipzig, but not later. In the villages also it became wholly extinct fifty or an hundred years later; and only single words passed over into the German language. But this was not the case with their usages and other national peculiarities; there are still several tribes, nay the peasants of whole provinces in this part of Germany, in whom the Slavic origin can be distinctly traced.¹⁰⁹ Their language however was

ramsin's History of Russia, Vol. III. p. 160. Compare Henderson's Travels in Russia, p. 191.

¹⁰⁸ See Cramer's *Pommersche Kirchen-Historie*, L. I. c. 29.

¹⁰⁹ Among others the peasants of the duchy of Altenburg, who are highly respectable through a certain degree of cultivation, rare among German peasants, and distinguished for their wealth and prosperous

driven into the remotest eastern corner of their former extensive territory, and is there, and only there, still to be heard. We speak of the province called Lusatia, situated between Saxony, Bohemia, Silesia, and Brandenburg, of which the greatest part is at present under the Prussian dominion, and the smallest but richest portion under that of Saxony.

Lushitze, Lusatia, Germ. *Lausitz*, signifies in Slavic, a low marshland. This name was formerly applied only to the north eastern part of this province, or Lower Lusatia, which is, or was at least at the time of the Vendish settlement, a country of that description. At a later period, the name was carried over very improperly to the south-western part, or Upper Lusatia, a beautiful and mountainous region. Lusatia was given by Henry I as a fief to the margrave of Meissen. In the course of the following centuries, its two parts were repeatedly separated and reunited, alternately under the dominion of the last-named margrave, of Poland, or of Bohemia, without however belonging to the German empire. In the fourteenth century it was at length incorporated with Bohemia, and remained so for nearly three hundred years. To this circumstance alone the partial preservation of the Vendish language is to be ascribed. At the peace of Prague, A. D. 1636, it was allotted to Saxony. At the congress of Vienna in 1815, it was assigned, with the exception of the smaller half of Upper Lusatia, to Prussia, to which monarchy it still belongs.

§ 1. *Language of the Sorabians in Upper Lusatia.*

The cities of Bautzen, Zittau, Kamenz, Löbau, and their districts, form the Saxon part of Upper Lusatia. Of its 195,000 inhabitants, about the fourth or fifth part still speak the Vendish language. In the north eastern part of Upper Lusatia, which belongs to Prussia, there is about the same proportion of Vendish inhabitants. In both territories the whole number of Vendes is about 100,000. Their language is very nearly related to the Bohemian; where the Sorabians of Lower Lusatia and the Poles pronounce the letter *h*, the Upper Lusatians and Bohemians give the sound of *g*. Both Lusatian dialects have of course lost very many of their original peculiari-

condition. Although long since perfectly Germanized, certain Vendish usages have been kept up among them, more especially at weddings and similar festivals, the details of which are very interesting.

ties ; thus both have adopted the article from the German language. Even as late as the seventeenth century, attempts were made to eradicate them completely. German pastors were installed through the whole country ; a measure which had indeed the result, that in a short time sixteen communities or parishes were Germanized. But in 1716 they succeeded in obtaining the erection of a seminary at Leipzig for the education of Vendish ministers ; and in A. D. 1749, another was instituted at Wittenberg. Some successful attempts to commit this dialect to writing had already been made at the time of the Reformation ; but their grammar and orthography were then unsettled, and are so still in part ; although Bierling in A. D. 1689 introduced a regular system of the latter, which has been adopted by later writers. Several patriotic clergymen have since been active in providing their people with useful books for religious instruction. Portions of the Bible were already translated in the seventeenth century. A version of the Old Testament was published in the year 1703 by Matthæi ; and one of the New Testament three years later by Frenzel. A translation of the whole Bible for protestants, made by several clergymen, appeared in 1729, and has been twice reprinted. A version of the Bible for catholics by Swotlik, is extant in manuscript.

The Upper Lusatian dialect acquired in this way a degree of cultivation, which of course, since most of those who speak and read it are of the common people, comparatively few are able to appreciate. In religious hymns, there is no deficiency ; and several cantos of Klopstock's Messiah have been translated into it by Möhn, in the measure of the original. In regard to the popular songs of the Sorabians, a kind of poetry in which most Slavic nations are so rich, no pains was taken until recently to discover whether they had any or not. But when on the publication of the remarkable Servian songs, the interest of the German public in this species of poetry became strongly excited, the Saxon minister of state, baron Nostitz, himself an esteemed German poet, turned his attention particularly to this subject, and succeeded in collecting several little songs, full of that sweet, half pensive, half roguish feeling, which characterizes Slavic popular poetry in general. They were translated by him and communicated in manuscript to his friends ; but whether they have ever been printed we are not informed.¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ Grammars and dictionaries of this dialect are : Matthæi's *Wendische Grammatik*, Bautzen 1721. Bierling's *Didascalia*, Bautzen 1689. Ticini *Principia lingue Vendicæ*, Prague 1679—82. Augustin

§ 2. *Language of the Sorabians in Lower Lusatia.*

Lower Lusatia, or the north-eastern part of the Lusatian territory, together with the adjacent circle of Cöthlen in Brandenburg, has about the same number of Wendish inhabitants as the upper province. The dialect they speak has a strong affinity with the Polish, but is, like that of their brethren in Upper Lusatia, corrupted by German interpolations, and even in a still greater degree. It is obviously on the decline, and we can only expect, that after the lapse of a hundred years or less, no other vestige of it will be left than written or printed documents. The first book known to have been printed in this dialect, which is written according to a peculiar combination of the German letters, is Möller's Hymns, Catechism, and Liturgy, Bautzen 1574. Their present literature, like that of Upper Lusatia, is confined to works for religious instruction, grammars, and dictionaries. Of the former they possess no small number. They have also a complete version of the Bible. The N. Testament was translated for them as early as 1709, by Fabricius, and printed together with the German text. It has been repeatedly reprinted; and in the year 1798 a translation of the Old Testament by Fritze was added.¹¹¹

APPENDIX.

According to recent intelligence, received since the preceding pages were written, Prof. Schaffarik, to whose History of the Slavic languages we have so frequently had occasion to refer, is at present engaged in a larger work upon the same subject. In order to live entirely for these studies, he has retired from his professorship at the school of Neusatz, and has removed to Prague. The completion of his great work can hardly be expected at a very early date; since, according to his own statement in a letter to Prof. Maciejowski, he is at the same time

Swotlik Vocabularium Latino-Serbicum, Bautzen 1721. There are several others in manuscript; see Schaffarik's *Gesch. der Sl. Spr.* p. 483.

¹¹¹ Philological works on this dialect are: Hauptmann's *Wendische Sprachlehre*, Lübben 1761. *Kurze Anleitung zur wend. Sprache*, 1746. Megiseri *Thesaurus polyglottus*, Frankfurt 1603, including the Lower Lusatian. Several vocabularies of this dialect are extant in manuscript; see Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Sl. Spr.* p. 486.

engaged in no less than eleven other literary works. We give here a translation of another of his letters, communicated in the Polish papers; from which the reader will perceive what rich additions we may anticipate from his work, to our knowledge of some of the branches of Slavic literature.

"I am at present particularly engaged in collecting materials, for my work on the history and literature of the southern Slavic tribes. After five years of fruitless endeavours, I have at length succeeded in opening the way to many monuments of this literature, which have been hitherto either unknown or inaccessible. Indeed, by order of the superior catholic clergy, search is now making throughout Croatia, Slavonia, etc. and all that is found is to be copied for me. It is astonishing, how many books have been written and published since the fifteenth century in the Servian-Illyrian and Croatian dialects, of which even the most distinguished of our literary men, as Dobrovski, Kopitar, and others, seem not to have had the remotest idea! But the Illyrians and Croatsians themselves do not know what they possess—like the Bohemians, who know one half of their ancient literature only from catalogues, i. e. only the titles of the books. I have also succeeded in bringing to light some documents of the Servian literature. Almost every time that I travel through Slavonia, the Banat, etc. I meet in the old churches and convents with books hitherto unknown. Would that I could visit Bosnia, Herzegovina, Macedonia, and Bulgaria! A manuscript hitherto unknown, of a statute of Tzar Dushan, I have copied and translated for Prof. Maciejowski at Warsaw, and have commented upon it so far as was possible. Of all this my History of the Slavic Literature will in due time give a full account. Up to the present time, I have only completed the history of the Slavic-Illyrian literature, or that of the catholic and Greek Servians, that of the Croatsians, and of the Slovaks. As to new works by authors in this region, there is not much to be said. Not a few Servian works appear indeed, but they are mostly unripe productions of youthful students. Vuk Stephanovitch writes no longer; formerly chief judge at Belgrade, he now resides at Semlin without any appointment. This is much to be deplored; for he has deserved a better lot."

ART. II. THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH.

By F. Münter, Bishop of Zealand. Translated from the German by E. C. Tracy, A. M.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The following article was first published after the death of the author, in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1833, 1tes Hest, p. 54 sq. Bishop Münter, the writer, was universally regarded as one of the most learned scholars of the age, especially in the department of Ecclesiastical History and Antiquities. He was born at Gotha, A. D. 1761. His father was afterwards invited to Copenhagen as one of the pastors of the principal German church in that city, where he became distinguished for his eloquence as a preacher, and his influence as a clergyman. He is known to the Christians of other countries, by the narrative which he published of his intercourse with the famous count Struensee, after his condemnation. The son was educated at the university of Copenhagen, where he finished his course at an early age, and with great applause. In 1781 he proceeded to Göttingen, to pursue further the studies connected with the profession of theology. In the spring of 1784, he made a journey to Italy under the royal patronage, where he resided something more than three years, chiefly at Rome, but visiting also Naples and Sicily. Of this latter country he afterwards published an account. On his return in 1788, he became professor extraordinary of theology in the university of Copenhagen; and after three years, was advanced to an ordinary professorship, in April 1790. This important station he continued to hold with honour to himself and usefulness to the church and world, until A. D. 1808, when he was advanced to the dignity of bishop of Zealand, the diocese which includes the principal island and the capital of the Danish kingdom. In this high office, besides the activity which he manifested in the performance of all the duties connected with his station, and the many reforms and improvements which he adopted and urged upon his clergy, he still found time to prosecute the studies to which his previous life had been devoted; and many of his most important works were published during this period. The writer of these lines had

the pleasure of several interviews with him at Copenhagen in the year 1827, and received a deep impression of his learning, as well as of the dignity and affability of his demeanour. The testimony of evangelical Christians was favourable to his personal piety and to the general tenor of his public exertions; although they regarded him as not being sufficiently decided in some particulars. Münter died April 9, 1830, in the 69th year of his age. A full and interesting sketch of his life and character by his son-in-law, Mynster, is contained in the same number of the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* from which the present article is taken.—EDITOR.

PART I.

Planting of Christianity in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

1. The date of the first preaching of Christianity in the British islands was long a subject of interesting inquiry with English literati, who were fond of ascribing to their church the highest possible antiquity, and even claimed for it an apostolic origin. A favourite testimony in favour of this last opinion, was a passage in the 5th chapter of the first epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, in which it is said that he [Paul] ‘preached the gospel to the utmost limit of the west,’ ἐν τὸ τέλος τῆς οὐρανοῦ. This was regarded as explicit testimony in proof of the apostle’s visit to Britain, inasmuch as the British sea was denominated by ancient writers the *western* ocean, the Britons were by the poets called *ultimi Britanni*, the Morini, on the opposite coast of Gaul, *extremi, ultimi hominum Morini*; and other expressions of the like kind were used, which Stillingfleet has carefully collected. We have also explicit testimonies from ecclesiastical writers. The apostles, says Eusebius,¹ were no deceivers. Such men might, it is true, have deceived their neighbours and countrymen with an improbable story; but what folly were it for individuals so unlearned, who were acquainted only with their mother tongue, to plan a scheme to deceive the world by preaching this doctrine in the most distant cities and countries. He then names the Romans, Persians, Armenians, Parthians, and Scythians, and proceeds to say that ‘some crossed the ocean to the so-called British islands’ ἐν ταῖς σα-

¹ Demonst. Evang. III. c. 7.

λαυμένης βρετανικῆς νήσου. Theodoret also names the Britons among the nations converted by the apostles;¹ and, besides, says explicitly,² after mentioning Paul's journey into Spain, that he also carried salvation to the islands that lie in the ocean,—meaning probably the same as in another place,³ where he says that the apostle, after his release from imprisonment at Rome, went into Spain, and thence spread the light of the gospel to other nations. Jerome also⁴ says that Paul, after his residence in Spain, went from the one sea to the other, and that his industry in preaching extended as far as the earth itself: and again (*de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*,) that after his imprisonment he preached the gospel in the western countries. Finally, Venantius Fortunatus also, in speaking of the apostle's labours, asserts the same fact:—

Transit et oceanum, vel qui facit Insula Portum,
Quasque Britannus habet terras, quasque ultima Thule.

The possibility of all this cannot be disputed. Between his imprisonment at Rome and his death, Paul had ample time both for the journey into Spain, so often mentioned by ancient writers and which we know from Rom. 15: 24, that he intended to make, and for a visit to Britain. There were on that island, from the reign of the emperor Claudius, Roman colonies, civil as well as military, among which London was probably already reckoned.⁵ An intercourse was therefore undoubtedly kept up between Rome and Britain; and Stillingfleet, by a very sagacious comparison of circumstances, has pointed out a particular inducement that Paul might have had for the supposed visit. It is this:—Pomponia Græcina, wife of A. Plautius, the Roman governor under Claudius, appears to have been a Christian; for, as Tacitus informs us,⁶ she was accused of attachment to a foreign superstition—by which Christianity is supposed to be meant—but acquitted, on domestic trial, by her husband. She *may* therefore have been converted by Paul, who was then already in Rome; and just as the intercourse between Paul and Seneca, so often mentioned, *may* have been a motive for the apostle's journey into Spain, the native country of the Roman philosopher, so it is possible that Pomponia

¹ Sermon 9.

² In *ψ*. 116.

³ On 2 Tim. 4: 17.

⁴ On Amos, c. 9.

⁵ Stillingfleet, p. 43.

⁶ Annal. XIII. 32.

Græcina pointed out to him the happy results that might be expected, from extending his mission from Spain into Britain. But all these are mere *possibilities*. And even the testimonies of ecclesiastical writers adduced in proof of Paul's visit to Britain, are of much less weight than would appear at first view. In the first place they do not all agree in asserting even that Paul ever visited Britain; most of them speak of the apostles generally, without naming any one of them. And secondly, we have so many testimonies of the kind, which speak in the most explicit terms of the preaching of the gospel throughout the whole world—testimonies the absolute universality of which must occasion doubts of the correctness of each particular like those in question; although there is evident from them so much as this, that Christianity was preached, although not by the apostles, yet by Christian teachers at a very early period, not only throughout the Roman empire, but beyond its confines, and had in those distant countries at least some adherents, mostly, it is probable, Greeks and Romans.

2. And this is indisputably true of Britain, since Origen and Tertullian agree in asserting it. The former, in his fourth Homily on Ezekiel, asks: "When, before the coming of Christ, did the country of the Britons adopt (in opposition to the Druids) the belief in one God?" So also in another passage, (in *Lucam* c. 1. Hom. 6,) "The Saviour's power is also with them in Britain, who are separated from our world; with those in Mauritania; and all under the sun who believe on his name." He must therefore have had information of the existence of Christians in Britain. Intercourse was certainly kept up between Britain and Egypt by means of the commerce of Alexandria. And so between the former and the coast of Africa; by which means Tertullian, or whoever it was that about his time wrote the book *Adversus Judæos*, had received similar information. For in order to prove, in opposition to the Jews, that Christ was the true Messiah, he says (cap 7,) "*Getulorum varietates et Maurorum multi fines, Hispaniarum omnes termini et Galliorum diversae nationes, et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita.*" It cannot be denied that there are exaggerations here; but that there were Christians in the place named is certain, since the passage would otherwise have been of no force as proof against the Jews. And the *Romanis inaccessa loca* of the Britons, must be looked for either in the interior of the island and over towards Ireland, or beyond the wall kept up against

the North Britons since the time of Adrian ; the second line established by Severus being entirely out of the question.

Gildas, also, the most ancient British author, speaks of the continued existence of the christian church in Britain from the first planting of the gospel to the persecution under Diocletian, observing however that it was not sustained with uniform zeal.¹ With this statement the passage in Sulpicius Severus,² in which he speaks of Christianity as having just become known for the first time beyond the Alps, at the time of the persecution under the emperor Marcus Aurelius, contains nothing inconsistent,—the prominent fact of which he speaks being this ; that Christians in *Gaul* were then first called to suffer for their profession, which he attributes to the recent planting of the gospel there.

3. Nennius and Bede³ relate that, about the end of the second century, a British prince named Lucius (not king of Britain, for there were no such kings in that age) sent to a bishop of Rome for missionaries ;—that they came, and made converts of him and his subjects. It may have been so. There may have been such a prince ; Usher believed that he had seen a coin of his stamped with a cross and the letters LVC.⁴ But modern writers of numismatics know nothing of such a coin. The cross however is by no means uncommon on the most ancient British coins, and is of course proof that Christianity was the religion of the princes in whose dominions and under whose reign those coins were struck,—could we but tell exactly where and when it was.⁵

Although the churches in Britain were, according to Gildas, rather lukewarm and inactive during the whole of the third century, Christianity must yet have made advances. Otherwise the persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, in the year 303, would not have extended to British Christians. That such was the fact, we learn from the testimony of Caecilius or Lactantius in his well known work, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 12. The stedfastness of some confessors and martyrs won for religion, here as everywhere, new adherents ; and when Constantius

¹ Stillingfleet, p. 54.

² Sulpicius Severus, Lib. II. p. 381.

³ Nennius' Hist. Brit. c. 18. Bede 1. 4.

⁴ Usher, p. 39.

⁵ Respecting Lucius, see Usher, Stillingfleet, and Spanheim. Comp. Studlin, 19, 20.

Chlorus, in the year 305, after the abdication of the two Cæsars, became emperor, the persecution spontaneously ceased. From that time, as Gildas and Bede agree in saying,¹ the churches flourished in great peace and harmony till the Arian controversy arose. With Constantine, Christianity ascended the throne of the world, and may have extended itself without opposition, under his protection and that of his successors, over all England, entirely supplanting the religion of the Druids as well as Roman heathenism. But alas! we have no facts to adduce; history does not furnish them.

4. But whence was Christianity originally introduced into England? Thus far the accounts that I have adduced seem to point towards Rome. Considering the relations that existed between the capital and what were then its western provinces, this would not be improbable, but for *one* circumstance, viz. the difference of rituals, from the earliest times downward, so far as our information extends, especially in regard to Easter—the British churches agreeing with those, not of the West but of Asia Minor, called on account of their peculiarity in this respect, Quartodecimans. This indicates clearly an Asiatic origin. And when we recollect that the churches of Lyons, Vienna, and in all probability of Marseilles also, were Greek churches, that they were closely connected with Asia Minor, and that the Greek language was understood by educated men in those cities—Irenæus indeed wrote in Greek—when we consider too that the Druids were also acquainted with Greek; we may with good reason infer from all these facts, that the British church was derived originally from the Grecian.

5. The history of the conflict of Christianity with British Druidism and Roman heathenism, that must have taken place, is lost. The latter doubtless was ready to fall to pieces from inherent weakness; and little effort can have been required to overthrow it. Of the former we are still too ignorant to make up, where there are no facts, opinions founded on the nature of the system. Their hierarchy was firmly established, exerting a pernicious and very powerful influence in all branches of the government; but what was the nature of their doctrines, whether they were theists or atheists, is still undetermined. Origen asks:² “When did Britain before the birth of Christ adopt the belief in one God?” And it is certainly a mistake of Cambden

¹ Gildas c. 8. Bede 1. 8.

² In Ezech. Hom. 4.

and Godwin, to maintain that Origen believed the doctrine of the divine unity to have been taught the Britons by the Druids.¹ The scattered notices that we have of the Druidical religion, tell us of heathen rites and offerings, and even of human sacrifices. The most that can be conceded is, that their secret doctrines, which yet they were obliged for their own advantage to conceal studiously from the people, embraced the great truth of the unity of God. But this could contribute nothing to the promotion of Christianity. The philosophers of Greece and Rome acknowledged the divine unity, and yet were opposers of the new religion which proclaimed on the house tops what they had taught only in secret. We may therefore regard as certain the fact of a conflict between Christianity and the Druids. The Irish traditions of which I shall soon speak, furnish additional reasons for believing it. The Scottish tradition also of Trathal, the grandfather of Fingal, who is said to have driven the Druids into exile, encourages the supposition that princes, weary of their hierarchy and their tyranny, may have thrown themselves into the arms of Christianity—as perhaps in the instance of the English Lucius above mentioned.

6. Of the first preaching of Christianity in Scotland we have only traditional information. The inhabitants of that country were entire strangers to Roman civilization;² although if we may believe the representations of the Ossianic poems, far from being such barbarians as they were represented by their neighbours, and in fact a noble race, capable of any improvement. They were called Caledonians. In the times of the Romans they were divided into two different races, Picts and Scots, who often made war on each other, and whose origin is still undetermined.³ That Tertullian's *Romanis inaccessa loca* need not necessarily be understood to mean North Britain, or the regions beyond the wall of Adrian, I have already remarked; but that in the thirty years preceding Constantine the intercourse between the Caledonians and the Romans, in war and peace, continued and increased, admits of no doubt. The Ossianic poems mention Caracal, son of the king of the world;⁴ and Ossian

¹ Stillingfleet, p. 57.

² Jerome. *Ossian* II. 241.

³ Finn. Magnusen.

⁴ *Ossian* II. 223. It is said that Fingal waged war against him in early youth.

speaks of his son Oscar's war with Caros (Carausius), the cotemporary of Diocletian.¹ We have even the tradition of a dialogue between Ossian and a Culdee; which however is made of little weight by another which introduces him in connexion with St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, who endeavoured to convert him,²—so that at most it only serves to show that missions to Scotland were spoken of in very early times.

Tradition mentions a Scottish king Donald, who received baptism, together with the queen, his children and many others, and at whose request Victor, bishop of Rome, sent teachers who effected the conversion of Scotland. This account is given by Hector Boethius, who wrote his *History of Scotland* in the year 1526. He probably obtained it from John Fordun's *Scoti-Chronicon*, written about the middle of the fourteenth century, where the same account is given more briefly and without any mention of Victor's name. In regard to occurrences of so early a period, the testimony of a witness who lived 1000 years afterwards is of little weight. But there may have prevailed in Scotland a tradition of the preaching of Christianity in the reign of the emperor Severus,—having some sort of connexion with that of Ossian's acquaintance with a Culdee. The name of the Roman bishop is chronologically correct. Victor died in the year 202. But how happened tradition to preserve this name as well as the event? It makes the account so much the more suspicious. When Fordun wrote, Scotland was catholic. All missions must of course have been sent out from Rome! Hence too the name of the pope! We shall see that, according to more authentic history, the first preachers of Christianity in Scotland were British and Irish instead of Romish priests. But it must be acknowledged in conclusion, that no history, even that of Ireland not excepted, is so fabulous and destitute of genuine and authentic documents, as that of Scotland; and even that when Scotland is named, one cannot be sure whether Ireland may not be meant.³

7. From its situation Ireland would naturally become acquainted with Christianity at a very late period; and yet we have very ancient accounts, which there seems to be no suffi-

¹ Ossian II. 224.

² Culdes are spoken of in Ossian. A Culdee is called son of the secret hall, (a hermit,) Ossian II. p. 391.

³ Stäudlin, p. 50, etc.

cient grounds for rejecting, of its first diffusion in that island. According to the old chronicles, a king named Cormac reigned there about the middle of the third century. Towards the conclusion of that century he is said to have resigned the government into the hands of his son Cairbar;¹ to have withdrawn into solitude, and devoted himself to studies connected with religion, legislation, and the art of government,—the results of which he committed to writing for the instruction of his successors. These studies led to a conviction of the vanity of heathenism and of the Druidical religion, to which he now declared his opposition, and publicly embracing the doctrine of the divine unity, he banished heathenism entirely from his house. His influence with the people was very great. The Druids became apprehensive of the overthrow of their system, and took great pains to bring him back to the faith of his ancestors. But he continued steadfast, and refuted their polytheism triumphantly. So far the Irish annals. Did we know more of this enlightened and for that age most remarkable prince, we might probably see how the seed sown by him sprung up and brought forth fruit on every side, till the appearance of St. Patrick about a hundred years later. As it is, we are able, with the assistance of other traditions, to show to some extent how the doctrines of the Druids became obnoxious to king Cormac.

The tyranny of the Druids had for a long time rendered them odious, and their power had declined because fewer of the nobility became connected with their order. Their overthrow in Scotland occurred about the middle of the second century. Trathal, Fingal's grandfather, was then chosen to command his countrymen in their war against the Romans—probably in the time of Adrian. On his return from the campaign, the Druids demanded that he should immediately resign. He refused to comply, and a civil war was the consequence. The Druids were defeated, and withdrew to the island of Hiona, Hy, or Iona; where the order was still kept up for a few generations till finally extinguished by St. Columba.² Hatred of the Druids thus became hereditary in the family of Trathal. His great-grandson Ossian never mentions them. Now Cormac was the son of Conar, a brother of king Trathal of Morven. He was elected king by the inhabitants of Ulster, to whose assistance he had been sent by Trathal.³ The Druids therefore, whose pow-

¹ Ossian II. 247.

² Gaelic Antiquities II. 242.

³ Poems of Ossian II. 247.

er in Scotland was about to come to an end, if not already quite lost, had reason to apprehend the same catastrophe in Ireland; and if they did not immediately suffer the like ruin, it was because Cormac attacked them with peaceful weapons only, and their overthrow was not effected by a civil war, as in Scotland.

8. Usher has estimated correctly the fables about missionaries who are said to have visited Ireland from apostolic times.¹ But the rejection of these is not saying that christian teachers from the neighbouring island did not pass over to preach Christianity there, especially after it became, under Constantine and his sons, the prevailing religion of the empire.² There are extant an evangelical history and some small poems of Coelius Sedulius, an Irishman, (he is called, it is true, Scotus, but Scotia means Ireland,) a Latin poet not without merit, belonging to a somewhat later age. He is said to have been a pupil of an Irish archbishop named Hildebert, who has sometimes been confounded with Hildebert of Mans,—the fact that the two individuals flourished in ages far distant from each other being overlooked. Now wherever Hildebert may have lived, whether in Ireland or elsewhere, an archbishop in Ireland he certainly was not. But Sedulius obtained his learning and accomplishments on his travels, especially in Italy. He is sometimes called Antistes and Episcopus, and sometimes Presbyter. Respecting all this however nothing can be determined. We only know that Balæus calls him Scotorum Australium Episcopus.³ But that writer is unworthy of credit. Ireland is said also to have had martyrs in those early times; whose names and the legends respecting them are cited by Usher. Leaving all these points undecided, we agree with the learned primate that there were Christians in Ireland before the time of Palladius.⁴ Of him, a cotemporary, Prosper of Aquitaine, says that he was sent, in 431, by bishop Cœlestin of Rome, to the Scots (Irish) who already believed in Christ, as their first bishop.⁵ He was probably a native Briton and a deacon of the Roman church. Now tradition tells of four individuals who had been bishops in Ireland before him.⁶ But we leave this to the *Acta Sanctorum*. Their names were Ailbe, Declan, Kieran, and Ibar. They must nevertheless have

¹ Prim. c. 16.

² Usher, p. 405.

³ Usher, 408.

⁴ *ibid.* 416.

⁵ Chron. ad h. a. in *Canisii Lect. Antiq.* I. p. 309.

⁶ Usher, p. 417 seq.

been cotemporary with St. Patrick; and although they also were sent from Rome, yet did not at first agree with him. This is perhaps the only truth in the whole story,—the statement, we mean, that Patrick, when he came to Ireland, met with opposition from some bishops there. Usher has taken great pains to reconcile the assertion of Prosper, that Palladius was the first bishop [*primus episcopus*] sent to Ireland by the bishop of Rome, with the opinion that there were bishops there before. Either the archiepiscopal dignity may be indicated by the word *primus*; or Palladius may have been the first bishop of two sent by Coelestin; or he may have been the first sent by the pope, his predecessors having received consecration in England or Gaul. Strict catholics, it is true, will acknowledge as bishops in the west only such as are dependant on the see of Rome; and this is the drift of all the later Irish legends.¹ The Irish biographies of St. Patrick contain some notices respecting the mission of Palladius. Some of them make him an archdeacon of the Roman church. It is said that Coelestin sent him to Ireland with twelve others, (twelve, probably because that was the number of the apostles,) and that, on arriving at Lagenia, he was banished by king Nathi, son of Garchon. According to others he was persecuted by the heathen, and in peril of his life. Both may be true. Yet a few were baptized by him, and he built three small wooden chapels. He also left there four schools, to which he gave his books and some relics of the prince of the apostles. These are said to be preserved in a monastery founded by him. On his way back to Rome he was arrested by death in England, not far from the Pictish border.²

9. Patrick preached to the Irish with more success, and won for himself the name of their apostle.³ His father was a deacon, his grandfather a presbyter, and his mother a sister of St. Martin of Tours. He was born at Ailcluade, Ossian's Balcluta, near the wall of Severus and not far from Glasgow. The place then belonged to England, but now to Scotland, and has received in honour of him the name of Kirkpatrick. The year of his birth is variously stated; Usher fixes on 372. In his early youth his parents removed to Armorica; where they still resided when the Irish king O'Neil the Great, with an army of Irishmen and Scots, made an incursion into England and across to the opposite coast of Armorica, plundering the country and carrying away captives.

¹ Stäudlin, 40.

² Usher, 423 seq.

³ Usher, 426.

In this way Patrick, then in his 16th year, and two of his sisters were sold in Ireland. His treatment while a captive was harsh. For six years he was obliged to serve as a neat-herd; in the seventh, custom and the laws restored him to liberty. After his return home he soon felt a strong desire to go back and preach the gospel in Ireland, but some circumstances unknown to us prevented the gratification of his wish. His history for several succeeding years is involved in obscurity, and blended with stories of other captivities, the third of which at least seems to be coincident with the first. He spent four years with his uncle Martin of Tours, under whose guidance he prepared himself for the sacred office, and by whom he was invested with the tonsure and admitted to the orders of deacon and priest.¹ In 402, the year after Martin's death, Patrick, then thirty years old, went to Rome. He met, on his way, bishops Declan and Kieran returning to Ireland. At Rome he applied himself closely to his studies, living with the canons of the Lateran church; and afterwards visited many islands of the Tyrrhene sea, the residence of monks and anchorites. In 432, according to Usher, one year after the death of St. Palladius, pope Cœlestin sent him to Ireland. He had before been consecrated bishop, it is not known by whom, or whether in Gaul or at Rome. Many other individuals, probably Britons and Irishmen, were at the same time admitted to the lower orders of the ministry. He landed in Ireland, with twenty-four or according to others thirty-four companions, in the first year of Sixtus bishop of Rome. Nethi, the same prince who had successfully resisted Palladius, opposed him also. Another prince however, Sinell, son of Finchad, was open to conviction, and was the first Irishman that Patrick baptized. Thence he sailed to a small island near the coast of the earldom of Dublin, which received from him the name of Holm-Patrick. He then passed over to the coast of Ulster, and visited his old master, prince Milcon of dal Araida.² There he was joined by Cernoch, or as the English call him Carantocus, the son of a British prince, who came to share his labours. They agreed however to go, one to the right hand and the other to the left, and to meet but once a year. Easter being now at hand, Patrick determined to go with his attendants to Tara—the Temora so celebrated in the poems of Ossian, the

¹ Usher, 434.

² Usher, 441. Other particulars in Ständlin, 43.

residence of the Irish king and the chief seat of Irish heathenism—in order that there, according to Ps. 74: 14, the Lord might break the head of Leviathan in pieces. They went by water, and on arriving at Temora found the king, the princes, and the Druids just assembled for the celebration of a great festival. On the first day of Easter, Patrick with two of his pupils appeared in the midst of the festivities and requested to be heard. His sermon made a deep impression. The example of the queen influenced the multitude; and finally the king also determined to embrace Christianity, which then made rapid progress through the country.¹ The civilization of the people, and probably also their weariness of the domination of the Druids, prepared the way for Christianity. Patrick and his fellow labourers were unwearied in preaching; they travelled over the whole country, addressing themselves to princes and men of rank, and succeeded beyond all expectation. To follow them in their travels would be a kind of detail improper here, and appropriate only for a history. The chief idol of Ireland was Crom-Cruach. It was of gold and silver, and stood at Magh-slecht, surrounded by twelve stone ones (some say they were of brass and smaller) with gilded faces. To this the Irish sacrificed their first-born, and bowed themselves so often with face, arms, and knees to the earth, that three-fourths of the people died in consequence!! Hence the name, Magh-slecht—the place of bowing. This was exactly the Phœnician Baal; and the Irish too affirm, not without reason, that the horrid practice of human sacrifices was introduced into Ireland by the Phœnicians or Carthaginians. It is said that Patrick saw this, and that the idol was broken in pieces while he was praying.² The circumstance is related as a miracle, and some accounts add, that it was when Patrick raised his staff against it in a threatening manner that the idol fell, and that the twelve others sunk into the earth, their heads only projecting above ground. Where the people were weary of the burden of heathenism, such miracles might occur without difficulty. Churches were everywhere erected; but the establishment of episcopal sees was deferred while Patrick continued to itinerate. It was commenced about ten years after his arrival in the country. The earliest episcopal see was that of Clo-

¹ Staudlin 44.

² Bibliotheca Ms. Stowensis I, p. 41, 42.

gher, which he at first made his own residence. Afterwards he invested another with that dignity, and went himself to Armagh, where a large tract of land had been given him, and where he built a town of important institutions—a cathedral, many other churches, and monasteries; filled it with inhabitants, and established schools. Here it was his purpose to fix the metropolitan see. He now proceeded to obtain more assistants from England, whom he consecrated as bishops; and afterwards, it is not certain in what year, held a synod at Armagh for the organization of the infant church. The canons¹ show that every thing was yet quite unregulated; that there were even at that time in Ireland clergymen who indulged themselves in licentious and indecorous practices; and that monks and nuns were found there. Patrick held another synod, some of whose canons also are extant; such as ecclesiastical ordinances collected from its records at a later period. The date of this second synod is likewise unknown. Patrick's residence at his archiepiscopal church was not of long continuance. He again undertook missionary tours; on which we will follow him no further than to say, that he made converts of prince and people in the region where Dublin now stands, laid the foundation of the Dublin cathedral, and appointed a bishop; that, in Munster, where Christianity already had some confessors, he won over the king and the nobility, and at a synod which he held there made Emly the metropolitan see of the province; and that he thence returned again to Leinster, where, in addition to his other labours, he took part in political affairs. It was through his influence that king Logary II collected the ancient records relating to the history of Ireland, purified them from the stains of heathenism, placed them in the public archives, and caused copies of them to be put into the hands of the bishops for preservation in the churches. The same improvement was also undertaken in regard to the laws; they were entered in what was called the *King's Psalter*,² which was deposited in the royal palace.

Thus did Patrick exert a beneficent influence on the civilization of the kingdom. He went systematically to work. It was now, when order reigned throughout, that he was first able to divide into provinces the churches and monasteries that he

¹ Wilkins' Concil. M. B. I, p. 8.

² Stäudlin, p. 46, 47. There is a manuscript of the *Psalter of Cashel* in the Bodleian Library. See Biblioth. Ms. Stowensis, I, 165.

had founded, and to provide, by tithes and other sources of income, for the support of the priesthood. Of course the abandoned lands and other property of the Druids must first of all have been devoted to that purpose. Care also must doubtless have been taken that the people should not, by the imposition of many novel taxes, be prejudiced against the new religion in the outset. What was transferred from the old to the new, was not felt as a burden, since the people were accustomed to it.

After his return to Armagh, he named Benignus, whom he had consecrated bishop, as his successor there,—probably that he might be able to devote himself entirely to the missionary work, which he afterwards prosecuted indefatigably in Leinster and the northern parts of Ulster. Some years after he visited Rome, where Leo the Great was then pope, probably for the purpose of perfecting his ecclesiastical organization after the model of the Roman; for the particular objects of his journey are not known. So much as this however, is certain,—that nothing was further from his thoughts, highly as he revered the Roman bishop, than to subject the Irish church to the Roman pontificate. He always acted in his own name, not in that of the pope. In connexion with the king, the clergy, and the laity, he appointed and consecrated the bishops. On his return through England he made known the rules of the monastic order founded by him (*cursus Scotorum*), and took bishops and monks with him to Ireland. In Ireland itself he was no longer archbishop of Armagh, but in fact the father of priests and people, invested with all the power that filial reverence, love, and confidence could give, which he used to promote the best interests of the whole. It was apostolic power that he exercised, and in the strength of which he travelled about, teaching, holding synods, correcting irregularities, introducing discipline into the churches, etc. In such labours he still continued for a series of years his active and most useful life. He retired finally to the monastery of Paul at Armagh to spend his last days, and died there in extreme old age, having reached his one hundred and twentieth year.¹ His miracles history is willing to pass over in silence. Indeed they are mostly legends of a later century. Such a man allowed himself to practise no deception; nor did he need it. That a grateful people should place him over their altars was very natural. Few have deserved such religious

¹ See Stäudlin.

celebration of their memory as he and Anscarus. The biographies of him, Irish and Latin, are numerous. Usher has noticed the most important of them. According to his account there are sixty-five or sixty-six different ones. They are replete with fables and legends; but the truth may nevertheless be discovered in them. Jocelin in the 12th century used the more ancient ones for his life of this saint. His history is minutely, but as may readily be conceived, not critically related in the *Acta Sanctorum*, March 17. The fable of St. Patrick's purgatory, which may in some respects be compared with the cave of Trophonius in Boeotia, is now forgotten.¹ The place itself was destroyed by the protestants about the end of the seventeenth century.

PART II.

Schools and Learning in Great Britain and Ireland.

1. In the centuries immediately succeeding the great migration of nations, while all Europe sank more and more into barbarism, Ireland was still a bright spot; or more properly, the light of the east of Europe had retired into this island, lately civilized through the influence of Christianity, and began thence to throw its rays back upon the continent. This is the more surprising, as Ireland was never subject to the Romans, to whom all the other countries of western Europe were indebted for their civilization; and the fact remains certain, whatsoever of fable modern writers may have laboured to point out in the antiquities and early history of the island. The previous barbarism of the people, to which, but a short time before Christianity became known in Ireland, Jerome testifies, in no way conflicts with this statement. Even in that savage period, the character and state of the people must have been such as to afford great advantages for improvement. This is proved by the Ossianic poems, many of which picture to the life events that occurred on the soil of Ireland. In the cultivated state of the Irish in the eighth century we see the great progress which they had then made; and that this was not effected in a short time, but must have been the work of several gen-

¹ *Heiligen-Lexicon*, p. 1953. Casp. Löscher de fabuloso Patricii Purgatorio, Lips. 1670. Campion's *History of Ireland*, Dublin 1633, p. 39.

erations, certainly requires no proof. I feel myself at liberty to be the more brief here, because Thorkelin has placed the subject in the proper light in a separate essay,¹ and it will answer my present purpose just to mention the leading facts.

2. As early as the time of Tacitus the Irish seaports were better known than those of England, being places of more commerce. The origin of the linen manufacture of Ireland is lost in the remotest antiquity. The most ancient laws that have been preserved, prove also that when they were enacted agriculture and the breeding of cattle were in a flourishing state. The forests according to their prescriptions were enclosed. The cultivation of fruit was attended to, and the vine was not unknown to the Irish. The mechanic arts too were any thing but in their infancy. Carriages were used for travelling, which could not have been thought of without highways; and to them accordingly great attention was paid. On the mountains there were houses for the accommodation of travellers. The metals too were known. The Irish at an early period opened rich iron mines in their own country; so that they no longer found it necessary to purchase that metal from Celtiberian Spain.² Mineral coal for the forges was found in their own island. Of gold and silver they had an abundance, and wrought them into ornamental articles. In the country itself there was a flourishing domestic trade, fairs being held at regular times; and notwithstanding the very strict enforcement of the law by which all wrecks became the property of the lord of the adjacent coast, and the navigators his slaves, foreign commerce also prospered. The Irish visited foreign ports. They were acquainted with Iceland before the settlement of the Norwegians; and probably had a factory there, which they afterwards abandoned. They however visited the island in later times; for otherwise we cannot account for the canons of the Icelandic bishops against them. Their adventurous spirit led them even to voyages of discovery into the wide ocean, and very probably even to America.³ So much sagacity,

¹ "Beviis at de Irøke ved Ostmannernes Ankomst til Irland i det ottende Aarhundrede forliene en udmaerket Rang plandt de mest oplyste Folk i Europa paa de Tider." At the end of the fourth volume of the New Transactions of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, 1799.

² Iron is called in Celtiberian, *hierø*; in Irish, *ieran*, *irvan*; whence the English *iron*, the Norse *iarn*, and Danish *jern*.

³ Thorkelin, 579.

activity, and dexterity in arts and trades, in commerce, and in the affairs of civil life, cannot be supposed to exist without intellectual cultivation. And that the Irish were not destitute of it is perfectly clear.

3. The Druids may have led the way. They certainly confined themselves however to their own class and to the nobility. The influence of the Bards was in all probability much greater. They gave life to the imagination, awakened the feelings, cultivated the language. Many of the Ossianic poems, Cuchullin for instance, whose story tradition is to this day able to relate,¹ are Irish. The Irish at least are acquainted with that poem, and that it was composed before the introduction of Christianity into Ireland hardly admits of a doubt.² But it was Christianity that gave to the cultivation of these islanders its proper direction, and educated in the monasteries those who became the nation's teachers in science as well as religion, and scattered light abroad not only in England and Scotland, but across the channel into France and even to the heart of Germany. To these monasteries let our attention now be directed.

The monastery of Banchor, or Bangor, in England (to be carefully distinguished from the episcopal see of the same name, situated in Wales not far from Chester,) was one of high celebrity from the time of the British kings.³ It is said to have contained 2400 monks, who, being divided into classes of 100, and relieving each other every hour, performed divine service day and night without intermission, like the Accœmeti of Constantinople. This monastery sent forth numerous missionaries, who diffused Christianity on the continent.⁴ The study of the sciences was successfully prosecuted in it; and if it is true that Pelagius was born in the vicinity and was a monk there, it may be inferred that the instruction given to young ecclesiastics did not relate so much to inquiries into the being and attributes of God, as was customary in the east and in Greece, but rather to religious anthropology; and that this was the occasion of his adopting and cherishing the opinions associated with his name. But it would

¹ Luath.

² The heathen Irish had already a written language. Stäudlin, I. 38, 46.

³ Stillingfleet, 205. Stäudlin I. 37. The Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages were taught there; *ibid.* 120.

⁴ Stillingfleet, 205. Foe and Richardson's Tour, II. 387.

probably be difficult to adduce proof that Pelagius actually received his education at Bangor. Walch, at least, seems, in his History of Heresies, either not to have known or not to have credited the tradition. This monastery, which was in its most flourishing state when Augustine came to England, has now disappeared entirely; not even its ruins are any longer to be seen. It was during the irruption of the Danes, who were still heathens and had a bitter hatred of churches and monasteries, that it was assailed the most roughly.

4. It is well known that learning flourished greatly in England in the eighth century. Bede is a name of distinguished celebrity. But for him we should have known nothing of the early ecclesiastical history of England. Still more celebrated is the name of his pupil Alcuin.¹ Both, it is true, were of the conquering party, being Anglo-Saxons. But there was certainly even then a scientific intercourse at least between that people and the Britons. Otherwise we cannot conceive through what channel the Irish, who were never subject either to the Angles or the Romans, obtained their learning and sciences. It is at least the common opinion, and one never yet refuted, not even by Tiraboschi, that Charlemagne, to establish schools in Italy, was under the necessity of sending thither learned men from England and Ireland; and even if this opinion is unfounded, it is yet at least certain that these countries were then the only sanctuaries of learning.² Many schools were established there, and among them distinguished ones at Canterbury and York; the former under the influence of the Latin, and the latter doubtless controlled directly or indirectly by the primitive British priesthood, the Culdees, who had the principal agency in the establishment of Christianity in the north of England. These schools, as was generally the case in those times, were seminaries for ecclesiastics and for the nobility, even those of the highest rank. For kings and princes sent their sons thither, who brought with them to the throne a love of learning thus imbibed. Among these Alfred is known as distinguished above all others. Their libraries were valuable. In the seventh century, books were carried from Italy to England; now, under Charlemagne, they were

¹ See, respecting both, Heeren's *Geschichte d. St. d. kl. Liter.* I. 113. John Scotus *Erigena*. Stüudlin I. 127. Adamann, Bp. at Iona, *de locis Terræ Sanctæ*.

² Heeren's *Gesch. d. Stud. der klass. Literatur*, I. 104.

sought for, classic as well as ecclesiastical, Latin as well as Greek,¹ in the latter country and in Ireland.² The library that Egbert, Alcuin's preceptor, who was a brother of Eadbert king of Northumberland, collected in the archiepiscopal residence at York, was much celebrated as the most extensive one of the times.³ We have a poetical description of it by Alcuin himself, from which we can see what were the treasures it contained. They were chiefly Latin authors, although some Greek ones are also named, and among them Aristotle and Chrysostom. Hebrew manuscripts also are mentioned.⁴ Now such manuscripts were industriously transcribed by the Anglo-Saxon and British monks—even Alcuin having subjected himself to that kind of labour. Of all these treasures there is nothing extant, so far as we know, except what may be preserved in the library of the university of Cambridge, founded, tradition says, by Edward, the son and successor of Alfred; or what may at a later period have found a place of safety in Oxford. The plundering incursions of the Danes, who for more than a hundred years prosecuted with unheard of fury the work of destroying churches and monasteries, annihilated everything in those parts of both England and Ireland of which they had possession; and besides, the native princes waged against each other incessant civil wars, in which the country was laid waste with fire and sword.

5. About the middle of the sixth century, in 563 or 565, Columba founded the monastery on the island of Y-Kolmkill, best known under the name of Iona. It soon became a nursery of learning. From it also went forth the missionaries who planted Christianity in Scotland. Alas! of the library there, only uncertain reports have reached us. It is said that there was a Scottish king named Fergus II, that he accompanied Alaric the Goth, and that he sent to the monastery of Iona a box of books—being part of the booty obtained by him at the sacking of Rome.⁵ This story however is inconsistent with chronology;

¹ Archbishop Theodore's Greek Library. The disputes about Easter show that the Greek Fathers were known. Stäudlin I. 20. Cramer's Bossuet, V. 2; 85 sq.

² Alcuin's Letter to Charlemagne, Opera I. p. 52. ep. 38.

³ Heeren, p. 110 seq.

⁴ *De Pontific. et sanctis eccles. Eborac.* ap. Gale I. p. 730.

⁵ Jamieson, 303.

for Rome was plundered by Alaric in the year 410, more than a hundred years before Columba, who is said to have been born in 521. There was a report that the lost books of Livy were preserved in this library. Aeneas Sylvius (afterwards pope Pius II) intended, when in Scotland, to visit Iona to search for them, but was prevented by the death of king James I. A small fragment of what was reputed to be a manuscript of Livy, was brought to Aberdeen in 1525. It was ancient and difficult to decipher; but what could be read resembled the style of Sallust more than that of Livy. It was most probably a false report. Livy has been sought for everywhere, throughout the civilized world. A little before the Reformation there was a report that the lost books existed in the cathedral library at Drontheim; and it was pretended that, on inquiry, they were found to have been carried thence to Holland and there lost. And again, there was a story forty years ago that they existed in an Arabic translation in the emperor's library at Fez; but neither has this proved to be true. Of the existence of a collection of books at Iona, however, there can be no doubt. Otherwise Aeneas Sylvius would never have resolved on a journey thither. Boethius too had undeniable proof of it. After two fruitless applications, he obtained, in answer to the third, through the mediation of John Campbell the royal treasurer, a promise that the old manuscripts should be sent to him at Aberdeen;¹ and he actually received them. But, except the fragment that had been called a Livy, they seem to have consisted entirely of Scottish history and records, of which nothing has since been heard;—a circumstance that has brought upon Boethius the suspicion that, after availing himself of their contents, he destroyed them. Jamieson (p. 118) mentions other books that were probably once at Iona. The monks were celebrated for their medical skill.

The priory of the Culdees at Lochleven, also, which was given up to the Canonici Regulares about the year 1150, had a library.² A catalogue of it is still extant. But none of the lost works of antiquity are found on the list. It is made up of the Gospels and the Acts in Latin, choir books, missals, and some theological works of comparatively modern date. Not a single complete copy of the New Testament, to say nothing of the Old!³ This catalogue must of course satisfy us, that no very high opinion is to be cherished of the state of learning in that priory.

¹ Jamieson, 307.² *ibid.* 135.³ *ibid.* 376—77.

But it furnishes another item of information : the Latin ritual was observed there when the catalogue was made ; so the library may have been collected at a later period. There are said to have been libraries at Abernethy, Dunkeld, and St. Andrews. The history of the first runs back into remote antiquity. It was probably founded in the beginning of the seventh century. It appears that there was a school there.¹ We know absolutely nothing of the library at Dunkeld ; but as that monastery was in such high repute, and, after the destruction of Iona by the Danes in the year 801, was regarded as a second Iona and took its place, it is extremely probable that there was a school and a collection of books there also.² Of St. Andrews, since the seat of the primates of Scotland, the same might be presumed, even if Jamieson had not adduced express testimony to that effect.³

We cannot therefore form any very high opinion of the learning of the Culdees in the Scottish and Irish monasteries. The comparative purity of their religious views resulted from their separation from the other churches. They preserved the ancient doctrines of the East the more pure, because they came so little into contact with the other parts of Christendom, and because the usurpations of the Roman bishops and their adherents soon introduced a forced connexion. Of Greek literature they had none at all. At Iona there was in the ninth century a single work of Chrysostom ;⁴ and in the monastery of Lochleven there seems to have been something of Origen's. That they had the older Latin fathers is not improbable. In the controversies between Augustine and their countryman Pelagius, they must have taken—provided they understood the language—a lively interest. But their own literature was not barren.⁵ They read the Bible in the Irish language ; and a catalogue recently published shows what a large number of manuscripts are still extant in the Erse, (i. e. Gaelic,) which was understood in Ireland as well as in Scotland.—An inquiry into the extent of their knowledge in other departments would be foreign to our present purpose. Whether, for instance, they were versed in mathematics and in architecture, and were closely connected with the ancient architectural associations of England and Scotland, between which

¹ Jamieson, 113, 114.

² *ibid.* 137, 138.

³ *ibid.* 135.

⁴ Jamieson, 316.

⁵ They had even a Christian Latin poet, Sedulius, who was probably an Irishman. Stäudlin, I. 52.

and primitive freemasonry modern writers have attempted to show a connexion,¹—we must leave for others to determine.

6. We can here only instance the connexion, whether accidental or designedly formed, which they appear to have had with Constantinople in the ninth century. The anonymous author of the *Life of St. Chrysostom*² relates, that some ecclesiastics from a people who dwelt in the extreme parts of the earth, came to the royal city (Constantinople), to make inquiries respecting some ecclesiastical traditions, and especially the observance and exact computation of Easter; and that they visited the patriarch resident there. This patriarch must have been Methodius, who held the office from 842 to 847. To the question whence they came, they answered, from the schools of the ocean. They had, they said, a single work of father Chrysostom, which taught them clearly the faith, and to observe strictly the commandments. It was dear and precious to all; passed from one hand to another; was diligently transcribed; and there was no place and no family amongst them that was destitute of so important a treasure.³ It is difficult to determine whether these monks were from Iona or from Ireland, or indeed how much truth there may be in the whole account. But it is easy to conceive how Scots, and Irishmen too, might be acquainted with Constantinople, when we remember that Englishmen were to be found in the northern life-guard of the emperor, called Varagians. And in the ninth century this life-guard had already been organized.

¹ Krause, *Drey Kunsturkunden*.

² Written after the year 950. Cave.

³ Toland, *Nazarenus*, p. 5, 6. Jamieson, 316—17.

ART. III.—GREEK AND ENGLISH LEXICOGRAPHY.

From the London Quarterly Review.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

The direct bearing which the subject of Greek Lexicography in general has upon the proper study of the New Testament, is a sufficient apology, if any were demanded, for inserting in a work devoted to Biblical Literature, the following able article from a cotemporary foreign journal. It is found in the latest number of the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. LI, No. 101. References in it to a similar though less general article in No. 44 of the same work, and a comparison with that article, furnish intrinsic evidence that it comes from the same author, Dr Blomfield, the present bishop of London, one of the most accomplished Greek scholars of the age. A brother of his, the translator of Matthiæ's Grammar, was still more distinguished ; but died in early life. To him allusion is made in the first paragraph below.

This essay will be found not merely a valuable critique and contribution to literary history ; but it everywhere brings into view and discusses the true principles on which the study of the Greek language (and of course every other) ought to be prosecuted. The absurdity of studying one dead language through the medium of another, is fully set forth ; and this exhibition was to us the more gratifying, as it corresponds entirely with the views which we had many years ago occasion to express. But more than this ; Dr Blomfield, in laying down proper rules for the compilation of a lexicon, gives also necessarily the rules which ought to direct the private student in the investigation of the words of a language ; since a good lexicon is and can be only a record of the results, at which the student aims to arrive. In respect to every word, he investigates its origin, its fundamental form and signification, the various forms and senses in which it has been used in the different epochs and dialects of the language, and the manner and order in which all these are derived from the radical one and from each other ; and when

all these points are properly ascertained and arranged in his own mind, then and not till then, is he master of the word in question. The transcript of this view, with the necessary vouchers, is the lexicography of that word. To Passow, the writer of the following article strongly and justly ascribes the merit of having first applied this method to the Greek language; but Passow would himself have been the last to claim this as an exclusive merit. It seems to have been rather the general result of a better method of philosophical study, which has sprung up during the present century among the scholars of Germany; and in respect to which the names of Hermann, Buttmann, Jacobs, Passow, Tittmann, Winer, and others, are particularly conspicuous so far as relates to the Greek language. The same method was applied with great success to the Hebrew by Gesenius, so early as 1810; and to him in truth belongs the merit of having first exemplified it, in its full application to the lexicography of any language. The principles on which he proceeded, may be seen in the preface to the editions of his lexicon of 1810, 1823, and 1827; and in the *Bibl. Repos.* Vol. III. p. 39 sq. They are the same, *cæteris paribus*, as the rules given by Dr Blomfield towards the close of the present article.

Some of the admissions of the reviewer in respect to the state of the *critical* study of the languages, or rather the study of philology as a science, in England, may perhaps be startling to the American reader; but a course of not cursory observation for several years past, has long since convinced us, that they are not too broad. The remarks on Donnegan's *Lexicon* we had thoughts, at first, of omitting; but we believe that every American student ought to know the exact literary value of every work put into his hands as a daily guide; and as we happen to know that the opinions here expressed and fully sustained by proof, are also entertained by some of the first Greek scholars in our own country, we have felt it to be our duty to give that portion of the article entire.—EDITOR.

1. *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, von J. G. SCHNEIDER, Professor and Oberbibliothekar zu Breslau. Dritte Ausgabe. 2 Bde. 4to. Leipzig 1819.
2. *Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache*, von FRANZ PASSOW. Vierte Ausgabe. 2 Bde. 8vo. Leipzig 1830—1831.
3. *Thesaurus Græcæ Lingua*, ab HENRICO STEPHANO constructus. Post editionem Anglicam novis additamentis auctum, ordineque

alphabetico digestum, tertio ediderunt, C. B. HASE, etc. Parisii 1831.

4. *A New Greek and English Lexicon, principally on the plan of the Greek and German Lexicon of Schneider, etc.* by JAMES DONNEGAN, M. D. 1 vol. 8vo. London, 1st Ed. 1826. 2d Ed. 1831.

WHILE we pride ourselves, and with reason, in having left our continental neighbours at an immeasurable distance behind us in all the great branches of the arts, and are at least keeping pace with them in the different departments of science, we are contented, it seems, to hold in our classical knowledge a quite secondary rank. In the study of the dead languages in general, but more particularly of the Greek and Latin, the Germans have taken the lead, not only of us, but of all the rest of Europe, and have gained such a decided ascendancy, that their neighbours appear to have given up all hope of rivalling them, and are satisfied to follow as mere servile imitators of their triumphant career. Some splendid exceptions may be found in the names of Porson, Elmsley, Gaisford, Blomfield, Mitchell, and perhaps one or two others, who have ventured to think and examine for themselves, and whose exertions in the service of Greek literature have placed them on a level with the most distinguished of their cotemporaries; but when we consider how universally ancient Greek is studied in this country, it seems surprising that such instances of acknowledged superiority should be so rare amongst us. But the fact is, that the study of Greek with us is any thing but critical, and it must follow as a necessary consequence, any thing but deep and accurate. With some it is the fashion to look down on the labours of the critic as beneath the notice and even incompatible with the character of the excellent scholar; others are satisfied with a very superficial knowledge of the classics, preferring to rove through the modern languages or some of the numerous branches of science—ambitious perhaps of being what is termed general scholars; and others again are cut short in their classical career, being obliged to dedicate their time and talents to the particular studies of some profession. Whatever the causes may be, the fact cannot be denied, that we have comparatively few really classical scholars, few who enter deeply into the study of the Greek language, into the examination of its structure, of its formations, of its analogies. In proof of which we need say no more than this, that for the best edition of almost every Greek classic, and the best

notes of every edition, we are generally indebted to our German neighbours; that the best, nay the only Greek grammars worthy of the name, are those of Buttmann, of Matthiæ, of Thiersch; and the only Greek lexicons of any value since the time of Stephanus and Scapula, are two of those named at the head of this article, the recent Works of Schneider and Passow.

It is not our present intention to examine into the causes of this superiority of the German classics over all their neighbours, though we do hope, at no distant time, to dedicate a few of our pages to a subject which we have much at heart; at present we will confine ourselves to one point of primary importance—that which must be the first step to any decisive advance in our knowledge of ancient Greek—we mean the possession of an accurate and comprehensive lexicon of that language explained in our own tongue.

Until within a very few years it has been impossible to get at Greek but through the medium of Latin. No Greek lexicon—nay, no Greek grammar* has been composed but in that language; and every commentator and almost every translator has been forced to adopt it, as the only vehicle by which he could venture to explain his author, as the only armour in which he could dare to enter the lists of criticism. Had an English scholar proposed, but a few years ago, to publish a Greek and English lexicon, his adventure would have been received with either disregard or contempt, his scholarship would have been called in question because he had condescended to use his mother tongue in preference to a dead language, and the whole host of university tutors and country school masters would have taken fright at so degrading a novelty. But the opinion of the English classical world has of late undergone, in this particular, a complete revolution. We have begun to acknowledge that the short and straight course is preferable to the longer and devious one; that our own mother tongue is a better medium for expressing our ideas clearly and definitely than any dead language can be; and that by rendering a Greek word at once into English, instead of tracing it through the intricacies of Latin, (a language certainly less analogous to it than English,) there is a much better chance of the original idea being preserved exact and accurate; any fine and delicate distinguishing points are less liable

* The Port-Royal is an honourable exception, and we might perhaps name one more; but such rare exceptions are not enough to invalidate our assertion.

to be rubbed off; and shades of difference, which would very probably be lost in the uncertain obscurity of a dead language, are seen more plainly and can be marked more distinctly. In this, as in almost every other part of classical literature, the Germans have led the way, and set us an example which at last we seem anxious to follow.

We propose in this article to examine what progress the Germans have made in this their new line of lexicography, and whether the steps which we are taking in imitation of them (few and feeble they have hitherto been) are those best calculated to lead to excellence—most likely to advance us, be it ever so little, in the road towards perfection. For, in the commencement of this new career, it behoves us most especially to remember the old maxim, ἀρχὴ τὸ ἥμισυ. If we set out on true principles, our knowledge and our studies will all turn to good account, and even any errors we may make, not being fundamental, will be easily corrected; whereas, if our first principles be erroneous, whatever time and talents we afterwards bestow, must be in a great measure thrown away, and even that which is intrinsically valuable will be comparatively of little service. We intend, therefore, to examine minutely the different lexicons named at the head of this article, in order that, having seen their merits and defects, how far their authors have succeeded, and in what respects and why they have failed, we may be able to profit by experience, and to lay down such rules for the direction of future lexicographers, as may enable them to avoid the faults and improve on the excellences of their predecessors. For be it always remembered, that no single scholar, however great his talents and perseverance, can hope to produce at once a lexicon which shall make any near approach to perfection: it is only by repeated attempts, each improving on the former, that this most desirable object, can, if ever, be brought about.

The lexicon of Schneider has been in general use for some years in Germany, and—in name, at least—is well known to the scholars of this country. Its author was principal librarian at Breslau, and the well known editor of some of the best editions of different classics. The first idea of a Greek lexicon, interpreted in German, did not emanate from Schneider. It would be unfair to pass over, in total silence, the names of Dillenius, Vollbeding, and Haase, who at different times meritoriously preceded him, and set him that example which he has so well followed up, that his name must always be known as the

father of Greek and German lexicography. The first edition of Schneider's *Lexicon* appeared in 1806; but that was only in octavo, and did not profess to be more than a manual for younger students. In a few years appeared a second edition, considerably improved and enlarged; and in 1819 came out the third and last edition, in two thick and closely printed quarto volumes, followed, in 1821, by an Appendix, containing 180 additional pages. This last edition, which is a stupendous example of German industry, perseverance, and research, combined with an extensive knowledge of the Greek language, superseded at once, in the German universities, the use of every other lexicon, and fairly drove them all out of the field,—so much so, that Scapula's, even the Elzevir edition of 1652, we have seen sold in Germany for a few shillings.

The superior excellence of Schneider's lexicon consists in the amazing copiousness of its valuable matter; but this excellence is woefully counterbalanced by a total want of arrangement. Wherever a word, from the uncertainty or from the variety of its derivation or meanings, admits of, or requires a lengthened discussion, we have generally almost everything which can be desired, and sometimes a great deal more; but whether we find the original meaning at the beginning, middle, or end of the article,—whether the primary sense comes before or after the derivative, seems to be a mere matter of chance, according as Schneider met with it earlier or later in the course of his reading. Schneider's first edition of his lexicon was only a manual. When he was preparing his second and third editions, and examining (as he tells us in one of the prefaces) a number of different Greek authors with that view, it is to be lamented that he did not regularly revise and remodel his whole work, instead of patching it here and there with additions and improvements, as chance or opportunity led him. But it would seem that his other avocations took up too much of his time to allow of his following any plan of this kind; that, as he went on reading his authors and any passage or meaning struck him as worthy of remark, he added it at once to the article under which it should be placed, without examining whether it ought not rather to be incorporated into some other part. On no other grounds can we understand or explain the total want of arrangement in almost every article of any length, while we find quotation on quotation, and reference on reference, the whole so jumbled and confused together as frequently to require two or three readings to digest or

unravel. Merely casting our eyes over a few of the first pages of the lexicon, we may cite as instances of this defect, *ἄβρος*, *ἄ-γημα*, *ἀγκών*, *ἀγορά*, *ἄγω*, *ἀγωνιάω*, *ἀδέω*, *ἀδινός*, *ἀδρός*, *ἄζα*, *ἄ-θρόος*, *αἰανής*, *αἰδέομαι*, *αἰολός*, etc.

In like manner, a confused series of quotations, and references, and meanings constantly follow each other, and are so intermingled, that it is frequently impossible to know, without consulting the passages referred to, whether any particular meaning or quotation is intended to belong to the preceding or to the succeeding reference. This arises entirely from the careless and slovenly manner in which the quotations are noted down—the meaning given being placed sometimes *before* and sometimes *after* the passage to which it belongs—from a constant want of proper pointing—and from a total absence of capital letters, with which each fresh meaning or quotation ought to begin. This fault, like the former, disfigures almost every article of any considerable length.

And again, we might have expected that Schneider would make a point of quoting—as his authority for the meaning of a word—the most ancient, or one of the purest writers in which it occurs; that where, for instance, a word or a meaning was found in the old epic language of Homer, we should find Homer cited as the example. But, strange to say, Schneider has so much neglected, except in a few articles, those primeval monuments of the Greek language, that he frequently refers us to Apollonius Rhodius, Nicander, Oppian, Quintus Smyrnæus, or Nonnus, where he ought to have quoted the *Illiad* or the *Odyssey*; and in general we should think it more likely to meet with the solution of a difficulty occurring in some one of those later and comparatively unknown writers, than in those of an earlier and more classical period—of Homer, of Herodotus, of Pindar, or of Plato.*

Nor did Schneider sufficiently attend to the grammatical part of his lexicon. His strength did not lie in being an accurate grammarian. The consequences are, that he not only did not weed out numerous ungrammatical words and forms, which had been introduced, from time to time, into former lexicons, until their legitimacy had almost ceased to be doubted; but he and his fellow-labourers† have deluged his lexicon with a fresh flood

* Schneider had previously published a very excellent edition of Nicander and Oppian.

† Schneider had associated with him, in preparing his lexicon, two

of doubtful words and forms, either drawn from unauthentic and disputed sources, or fabricated in order to trace some supposed analogy, or to form a link in some etymological chain. There can be no doubt of Schneider having been fully justified in introducing, from the old grammarians, or even in *supposing* the existence of those old and obsolete forms of verbs, of which there still remain some tenses in use; but he has constantly carried this liberty further than was justifiable. In giving the tenses of the verbs, however, Schneider has not been so liberal: there we find constant and considerable deficiencies, as well as frequent inaccuracies. His principal attention seems to have been directed to the meaning of the word,—very little to its inflexions: nor does he appear to have ever thought of making any distinction between passive, middle, and deponent verbs, which, being so often similar in appearance, and so easily confounded with each other, require, therefore, to be marked with the greater care. As to the deponents, they are not even mentioned, from the beginning of the lexicon to the end. The particles, too—those most important parts of the Greek language, whose all-pervading influence is felt in every limb of every sentence—are invariably dismissed with a brief and unsatisfactory notice. The fact is, that Schneider's *forte* lay in natural history, in a most comprehensive knowledge of the natural productions alluded to by the ancients, and their various terms of art and science. In this he has had no equal,—no rival; here his lexicon is rich beyond hope or expectation; while points of great grammatical importance are slurred over in a few lines, half a page, or perhaps a whole one, is given to the discussion of some unknown bird, or some disputed plant. And yet, with all these drawbacks, Schneider's lexicon is an invaluable book; not a book for translation or abridgment, nor even to be used as the ground-work of future editions—which would serve but to perpetuate its faults—but a mine of wealth for succeeding lexicographers who shall know how to draw from, and use judiciously, the treasures so profusely scattered through its pages; who, forming their own plan, and adopting rules which Schneider has neglected, shall improve on his excellencies, avoid his faults, and supply his deficiencies.

scholars very unequal to such a task, named Wetzell and Riemer, to whose carelessness and want of judgment, Passow, in one of his prefaces, attributes much of this faulty exuberance.

And such, we are happy to say, it has proved in the hands of the learned and judicious Passow, the author of the lexicon which we have placed second at the head of our article. Schneider's lexicon had caused a great sensation in Germany; and sundry pamphlets and critiques appeared, at different times, pointing out its faults, and laying down plans and rules for the direction of future lexicographers; and, in 1818, the year before Schneider published his third edition, Passow, who was also of Breslau, a pupil of Jacobs and Hermann, and a friend and colleague of Schneider, commenced a *Manual-Lexicon*, formed on an entirely new plan, but embodying, on an abridged scale, most of the valuable matter of Schneider's third edition. The first part, containing *A* and *B*, appeared in 1819; the second, from *L* to *K* in 1821; and the two last, which completed the work, in 1823 and 1824. In this excellent little work, Passow began by correcting the want of arrangement in Schneider. His leading principle was to draw out, wherever it was possible, a kind of biographical history of each word, to give its different meanings in an almost chronological order, to cite always the earliest author in which a word is found,—thus ascertaining, as nearly as may be, its original signification,—and then to trace it downwards according as it might vary in sense and construction, through subsequent writers. For this purpose, he began—where every historical account of the Greek language must begin—with the primeval language of the epic poets, with a careful and critical examination of Homer and Hesiod. His intention then was to proceed to the Ionic prose of Herodotus, thence to what he calls the *Æolic-Dorian* lyric poetry, and afterwards to an examination of the Attic writers. It is one thing, however, to form a plan, and another to execute it. In his first edition, Passow, advanced but one step in this his admirably devised plan: he got no farther than the works of Homer and Hesiod; but these he examined with the greatest minuteness and accuracy. Hence this first edition was very unequal. For the works of those two great poets, it was, indeed, most comprehensive; it left little or nothing to be desired; but for the post-Homeric writers, it was much too concise, and passed them over too hastily, being, in that part of it, little more than an improved and corrected abridgment of Schneider. All the post-Homeric meanings were frequently comprehended in one sweeping, undistinguishing clause, generally without a quotation in support of them, or even the name of any author who used

them, by which their value and authority might be ascertained. Nor was any distinction made between those significations which a word had in the pure and classical times of Greece, and those which it acquired in the decline of the language. Except, however, being much deteriorated by this continually-recurring defect, Passow's first edition deserved the highest praises which could be bestowed on it; in all other respects he had very judiciously avoided the faults, and filled up most of the deficiencies of Schneider, as far as the size of his book would allow. He had left out all those doubtful vocables with which Schneider and his predecessors had loaded their lexicons, admitting none unless supported by good authority; and he had shown great discrimination, and a deep insight into the analogies of the language, by rejecting a vast number of those obsolete forms of verbs which Schneider had admitted so lavishly, and retaining only those of which there were evident remains, and in which he was justified by sound analogy. The primary sense of a word was always carefully marked, and the derivative senses so traced from it and from each other, as to make the connexion obvious. Any variety of construction occurring in different authors, was generally noticed; as also, whether the word was used principally by the epic poets, by the dramatic writers, or by the Attic prose authors. These last were points which had been almost entirely neglected by preceding lexicographers, and but slightly and occasionally touched on even by Schneider; while in Passow they are a very striking and valuable feature of his work. The syntax of the particles, also, was very elaborately worked, —perhaps more minutely than is necessary or even useful; but this is one of those points where it is difficult or almost impossible to draw the line between the grammar and the lexicon. Nor must we forget one very useful addition which Passow has made, —that of marking the quantity of all doubtful syllables. In a word, then, we should say of that first edition of Passow's lexicon, that, for the reader of Homer and Hesiod, it was all but perfect; for the study of other authors, it was only (it pretended to nothing more) a very admirable manual: but we must at the same time say of it, that, by its chronological history of the significations of words, it established a principle which must be the basis of all future lexicography; and that, by its admirable examination of the old epic language, it laid a sure and immovable foundation for future labours.

It was Passow's intention, in preparing a second edition, to

advance one step farther in his original plan, by examining the Ionic prose of Herodotus in the same way as he had done the writings of Homer; but unfortunately for the progress of genuine lexicography, a second edition was called for almost before the first was finished, and Passow, willing to answer a call so advantageous to his pocket, as well as gratifying to his character, gave up his plan for a time, and brought out, in 1825, the second edition, revised and corrected from the first, but without any very material additions. A third edition appeared in 1827—again revised, corrected, and very considerably enlarged, but without any farther progress being made in the original plan; and again, after the lapse of four years more, came out, towards the end of 1831, the fourth and last edition, now increased to two thick octavo volumes, each containing between 1400 and 1500 pages. In this work, which has left at an immense distance every other lexicon, even that of Schneider, Passow has put in execution the second part of his original plan, that of following up the explanation of Homer and Hesiod by an examination of the Ionic prose of Herodotus; and though he has not done it in so detailed a manner as he did the two poets, he has given, in our opinion, quite enough to satisfy any reader of Herodotus; and what he has given is done skilfully and with judgment. For we cannot but think, that, for a general lexicon, rather too much space is allotted to the meanings of Homer and Hesiod, too many quotations and references are given, every the most trifling shade of difference being marked, and oftentimes where the difference was not exactly in the meaning of the word, but rather implied in the thing signified: more minute Passow could not have been, had his lexicon, after the manner of Damm, been confined exclusively to those two poets. But in his account of the language of Herodotus, he has given all the most striking and most important significations,—all the forms and constructions peculiar to Herodotus and the Ionic dialect. More than this we can neither expect nor desire in any general lexicon. In this admirable book, Passow has not proceeded with his original plan farther than Herodotus, though we still find, in the other parts, very considerable improvements and additions, by meanings and extracts from many other authors; but he promises to proceed in his next edition with his original project, which we heartily wish him life, and health, and leisure to complete, although we fear that it is almost more than he can hope or expect. Should not Passow, however, be spared to finish

his Herculean task,* we have no doubt that Germany possesses many scholars worthy of treading in his steps, who, we hope, will judiciously pursue the same career which he is now pursuing with so much credit to himself and so much advantage to the classical world; and we may then expect, that not many years can elapse before Germany will possess a lexicon that may serve as a sure foundation and an almost perfect model for all others.

It is, perhaps, not strictly in accordance with the original pur-

* Since writing the above, we have heard that Passow has been taken off in the midst of his literary career. His death was mentioned in an English newspaper, but we have never seen any authentic account of it. [The preceding remark furnishes an example of the slowness of general literary communication between England and Germany. This article purports to have been written in Feb. 1834. Passow died March 11th, 1833. Obituary notices of him appeared in the literary journals for April, (issued at the close of that month,) and these were received in America in July 1833.—We subjoin a few notes of his life. Passow was born in Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Sept. 20, 1786. He was educated at the gymnasium of Gotha, chiefly under the immediate instruction of Frederick Jacobs. In 1804 he entered the university of Leipsic, where he devoted himself almost exclusively to the lectures and instructions of Hermann. In 1807 he was made professor of the Greek language in the gymnasium at Weimar; whence he removed in 1811 to take charge of the *Conradinum*, a large institute for education in the vicinity of Dantzic. This institution, however, was destroyed by the wars of the time; and in 1814 he repaired to Berlin, where in the society of the eminent scholars of that place, he passed a year of great enjoyment and privilege. In 1815 he was called to the ordinary professorship of ancient literature in the university of Breslau; where he entered upon that literary course, which has placed his name among the highest in Greek learning, and which was terminated only by his sudden death from epileptic paralysis, March 1833. The following paragraph from an autobiographical article, prepared by him for the Supplement to the *Conversations-Lexicon* now in the course of publication, exhibits the view which he himself cherished of his great work: "His chief literary occupation during the last twelve years, was his *Lexicon* of the Greek Language. The mark at which he aimed, lies in the observance of a severe historical development. If he may trust to many an applauding voice and to the approbation manifested by a rapid circulation, he may hope that this work with all its deficiencies will yet be of some permanent utility; and may perhaps, as he confesses to be his wish, bear up his name and memory beyond the limits of his life."—ED. or B. R.

pose for which we undertook this article, to notice the new edition of Stephens' 'Thesaurus' now in a course of publication at Paris. Our first object in taking up this subject was to aid and direct the progress of Greek and *English* lexicography, and in furtherance of this design we have been necessarily led to describe, at some length, the gigantic strides which the Germans are making in the same department. But Greek and *French* lexicography is still so completely in its infancy, that we shall learn little or nothing by noticing the progress made in that country. And yet, as the republication, and consequently the more general diffusion of such a body of Greek literature as the *Thesaurus* contains may be expected to have a considerable influence on the lexicographical knowledge of that language, whether a dead or a living tongue be the medium of interpretation; and as every student and every lover of classic lore must be interested in such a work,—we are sure that no apology is necessary for our giving an account of the plan and its execution, as far as we can judge from the few numbers yet published; nay, we rather feel, that were we to pass over in silence such a vast and influential undertaking, we might be fairly expected to give some strong reasons for such an omission.

The present publication, of which only three numbers have as yet appeared, is a reprint of the original 'Thesaurus,' with selections from the numerous additamenta of Valpy's edition, and fresh contributions from many of the leading scholars of Europe. The principal editor is M. Hase, assisted by M. de Sinner and M. Fix. Hase* is known in the literary world as having edited 'Leo Diaconus,' for the new edition of the Byzantine Historians; De Sinner has published an edition of 'Longus,' and of 'Buondelmonti de Insul. Archipel.'; and Fix was, we believe, a pupil of Hermann.

The wisdom or utility of reprinting any work of some centuries old, when the subject of it has been progressively improving, must always be very questionable. In the case of a Greek Lexicon, published more than two hundred and sixty years ago, when the philosophy of language and the great principles of etymology were little understood, and when the internal structure

* M. Hase entitles himself, *Instituti Regii Franciæ Socius*, in *Schola Regia Polytechnica Regiæque Speciali Linguarum Orientalium Professor*, in *Bibliothecæ Regiæ parte Codd. MSS. complectentia Conservator adjunctus*, etc. etc.

and analogies of ancient Greek were so much less known than they now are, to republish it, with all its errors and defects would seem to be a downright absurdity. And yet, whenever any new edition of the 'Thesaurus' has been talked of, it has been a very generally expressed wish among scholars, an almost *sine qua non*, that whatever additions might be made, the original should be reprinted entire and un mutilated. Now as long as this is made the basis of any new edition, as it was in Valpy's, and as it is in the present, so long will it go on to be "*rudis indigestaque moles*," a mazy labyrinth of valuable matter without system or arrangement, and requiring to be entirely remodelled before it can be anything like what it ought to be. It may be said, perhaps, in defence of this plan, that although in both the modern editions each article is first given with any errors and defects, as Stephens left it, yet it is immediately followed by other paragraphs, correcting the one and supplying the other. But why, it may be asked, reprint in the beginning of an article what is now an acknowledged error, merely to correct it at the end? Why leave deficiencies in one paragraph to fill them up in another? Why give in one page, etymologies or meanings now known to be incorrect, only to demolish them in the succeeding one? Why give derivative and secondary senses before the primitive and original, only to have to reverse them before the ink is dry? And yet all this and more than this is done in both the English and French editions of the 'Thesaurus,' for no other reason, that we can see, but to preserve and perpetuate errors because they are the errors of a Stephanus, who if he had enjoyed the half of our advantages, would never have committed them, and if he should now see them, would most assuredly draw his pen through them. It strikes us, that the only wise and useful way of republishing the 'Thesaurus' would be to give such an edition of it as we may suppose Stephens would now give, if he were alive to superintend it. And the editor who cannot be trusted to do this, is not fit to be the editor of the "Thesaurus" in any shape.

Although the new editors have engaged to preserve entire the matter of Stephens, even restoring some alterations made in the English edition, they have however ventured on making one most material change in Stephens' plan; they have adopted the alphabetical arrangement of words, instead of the etymological system of the original. Of this alteration we decidedly approve, as contributing to the ease and convenience with which the

'Thesaurus' may be consulted; and though there is much to be said in favour of the more philosophical arrangement, and some may still prefer it, yet we have no doubt but that it will be considered a great improvement by a very large majority of the classical world.

When the editors had adopted this alteration, one should have supposed that their first thought would have been how they might supply the void made in the etymological department by this their change of plan, and that they would have laid down for themselves some general rule for attaching the derivation to each word now separated from its family and connexions. But through the first number, and nearly to the end of the second, there is no appearance of their having given this a thought; consequently, some few words have a derivation as originally given by Stephens, a very few others have it added by the new editors, and the greater part have *none at all*. Towards the end of the second number, they seem to have bethought themselves of the necessity of some such plan; and through the third they have generally imitated Passow, by adding the derivation in *curved brackets*, immediately after the word, and before any of its significations. As they have thus early adopted a most excellent model, we should not have mentioned the subject, but that they have adopted it *only in part*; they have not followed Passow's whole plan, than which we know not a better. The part which they have omitted is this,—that when the derivation, from being doubtful or disputed, is too long to be placed at the beginning of the article, Passow places it at the end, so that we know at once where to look for it. For want of this simple device, the scholar, who happens to be looking for a questionable etymon in the new 'Thesaurus,' must wade through the whole of a long article, consisting of perhaps many paragraphs, before he can be sure that he has all the derivations which the article contains,—as, possibly, two or three separate paragraphs may each furnish a different one.

There is another blemish of a different kind, and of less importance, (some, indeed, may not think it a blemish,) arising from the attempt to distinguish all the interpolations and additions from the original matter of Stephens, and each from the other. The principle of this scheme is in itself so fair, and the means of effecting it are apparently so easy, that there would seem to be no reasonable objection to it; and yet, when carried into effect, it renders the present edition a most unsightly

work, and is frequently very puzzling and perplexing to the eye of the reader; a considerable part of almost every article being so filled with round, and square, and single, and double brackets, one within the other, that it requires extraordinary care and considerable practice to wind one's way safely among them.

Another branch of this same principle is productive of much more serious and extensive mischief. The three editors are to have, it seems, each his contribution inserted in a separate paragraph;* consequently, instead of an article consisting of one congruous and well-digested account, compiled from the various contributions of different editors and scholars, we have a number of different unconnected paragraphs, of which a very considerable part is superfluous, little better than tautology. First, we have whatever Stephens has said on the word, whether right or wrong, interlarded with every imaginable variety of brackets. Next comes, perhaps, a paragraph abridged from the English edition, together with contributions of Schaefer, Valckenaer, etc. embracing much curious and valuable information, but a considerable proportion of it fitter for the notes of a new edition of Hesychius than for one of Stephanus. Then follows a quarter or half a page of quotations from Ast's '*Lexicon Platonicum*,' (not selected, but transcribed,) nineteen-twentieths of which give *no new meaning or construction*. Then comes another long catalogue of quotations, by De Sinner or Fix, with some valuable points of information amidst a heap of useless repetitions. And very frequently, to crown the whole, comes Hase with a fresh list of quotations (*ohe! jam satis!*) from some of the ecclesiastical writers, with whom he seems very familiar, introduced for no reason, that we can fancy, but to show that Libanius or Basil used the word in the same common and usual sense that Plato or Xenophon had done before. Now surely, as we said in our XLIVth Number, in examining Valpy's Ste-

* The present editors have, it is true, improved much on their English predecessors: these inserted whole paragraphs and pages of contributions from different scholars; while the Parisians have certainly much compressed and curtailed them; but still they have not done enough. If they had carefully examined every article before it went to press, they might have omitted pages of useless repetition and tautology; we should not then have, in a paragraph of one editor, a heap of quotations to prove or illustrate what had been satisfactorily and sufficiently done in a preceding paragraph by his brother editor.

phanus, when two or three good authorities have been given for a meaning, it is childish trifling, nay worse, it is mere book-making, to lengthen *that* section by further quotations. It cannot, for instance, be of the slightest use to give nearly half a folio page of quotations and references, taken indiscriminately from a 'Lexicon Platonicum,' to show that so plain and common a word as ἀδίκη means *injuste facio*, or *lædo*, *violo*, *noceo*—senses established by more than sufficient authorities in the paragraph preceding. Nor is this a rare instance; it occurs in almost every other page, in ἀδικία, ἀδικος, ἀδύνατος, ἀθάνατος, etc. Nor can it be necessary for M. Hase, in such plain words as ἀβραῆς, ἀγύμναστος, ἀθεός, and we might mention fifty more, to cite a heap of quotations from Plutarch, after Aristotle had been given before; and this, not to introduce any new meaning or construction, but actually prefacing his paragraph by '*sensu proprio* Plutarchus—*sensu proprio* Hermes Trismegistus!' What a thing 'of shreds and patches' poor Stephanus will become!

It will be readily supposed, that amidst all this pic-nic of scholars and editors, it is quite out of the question to expect that, when we search for a word, we shall find its original sense the first. Nothing like it. Its original sense will be found quite as likely, or more so, in the middle or at the end of an article. Nor are we to expect, that an authority quoted is one of the earliest or purest in which the word occurs. Far from it. The word may have been perhaps used in the same sense by Homer; but the authority is more likely to be Philo. Many of these latter defects are not, be it remembered, to be attributed so much to the editors themselves, as to the unfortunate plan which they and their advisers have thought fit to adopt in *reprinting* Stephanus. Those, for instance, which we have last mentioned, are defects in the original; and a *reprint* of the original, with additions affixed to different articles, must necessarily contain all its defects, and in cases, particularly, of mal-arrangement, an accumulation of others. At the same time it would be unfair not to add, that we have found many useful and able paragraphs, showing extensive reading, and containing scholar-like remarks, particularly some by Fix, who appears to be not so long-winded as his colleagues. But now a word or two as to the length and cost of this new edition.

It may be recollected, that in our XLIVth Number we found it necessary to animadvert in pretty strong terms on the very

lengthy manner in which the English editors began their edition of this same 'Thesaurus,' and our animadversions had so far the desired effect, that the numbers published after the appearance of our article were surprisingly and advantageously curtailed. The present editors are not indeed to be compared to their English friends, in this respect, but still their labours will admit of great cutting down, and their work would be in every respect improved by the operation. But, indeed, some very considerable curtailment must be effected in the future numbers, if the work is to be brought within any-thing like the limits which the editors have laid down. Let us calculate, as nearly as we can, what length the book threatens to reach. The change from the etymological to the alphabetical arrangement precludes our forming any comparison between this and the original; but we may draw a fair guess from examining it along with the last edition of Passow. Each of the three first numbers of the 'Thesaurus' contains 160 folio pages, and the editors promise to finish it in 28 numbers, consequently the whole work should be only 4480 pages. The three numbers, containing 480 pages, reach to *αἴθων*. Now Passow, at *αἴθων*, has advanced only 48 pages:—consequently, the new Stephens is just ten times as long as Passow; and, carrying on the proportion, as Passow's Lexicon is 1500 pages, the Stephens will be 15,000. Dividing this by 160, the amount of pages in each number, we have rather more than 93 numbers, instead of the promised 28. We were so surprised at the results of this calculation, that we tried it by the last edition of Schneider and by Hederic, in both of which the result was still higher. The cost of so voluminous a work will, of course, exceed in the same proportion the price at which the editors put it in their Prospectus; it will be but a trifle under that of the English edition which their own prospectus so clamorously denounces.

Nor are the editors much nearer their promises as to the time within which their *opus magnum* is to be completed. Their first number, according to the Prospectus published in 1830, was to appear in April 1831, and from that time the work was to proceed at the rate of six or eight numbers in the year. We are writing in February 1834, and as yet we have heard of only four numbers (the fourth we have not seen); at this rate the publication will be finished about A. D. 1900. However, as only four numbers have yet been published, these editors have

time enough before them to profit by experience and advice ; and most earnestly do we entreat them, as they value the character of their work, to cut down, with unsparing hand, all useless excrescences. We know how difficult it is to do this—how invidious a task it is to curtail or omit the contributions of kind literary friends ; but, however unpleasant, it must be done. We observe the editors mention, among a host of contributors, (and, to our great astonishment, mention it as a matter of joy and congratulation,) that professor Struve, of Königsberg, has sent them eleven hundred articles on different words beginning with *alpha* ! We should have rather expected them to exclaim, as Pyrrhus did, after a dear-bought victory,—‘ A few more such, and we are ruined.’

We have hitherto noticed only the defects arising principally from the absurd plan of giving a *reprint* of the original, and the tautology caused by the still more absurd plan of the different editors contributing separate paragraphs to form one article. We will now add a few specimens of the imperfect manner in which the editors have used the means which are, or ought to have been, within their reach. We have hitherto spoken of redundancies, we shall have now to speak of deficiencies.

The first word in the lexicon, *ἀάριος*, is a striking proof of both ;—of much admitted, which is unprofitable, and everything omitted which could elucidate its meaning. It is rendered *noxius* and *innoxius* ; and then comes all the nonsense from Eustathius and the scholia of two alphas privative destroying each other—of the possibility of its meaning in the same passage, *carens noxâ*, or, ironically, *valde noxius*, etc. etc. Now there are two scholars, by whom the word had been handled in a masterly and satisfactory manner, viz. Passow, in his *Lexicon*, and Buttman, in his *Lexilogus* : yet the former is not once thought of ; the latter, who has discussed the word in all its bearings, so as to leave nothing to be desired, is just referred to in a most meagre and slovenly manner : ‘ *Diverso tamen modo Buttman,*’ etc. etc. Now can anything be more careless than, in so copious a work as this new ‘*Thesaurus*,’ which professes and ought to give the best and most ample information, to put the student off with a mere reference to a work *written in German* ? We have not time or space to give Buttman’s masterly dissertation on this word, but must follow the example of the French editors ; we do so, however, with the less reluctance,

because we have heard that a translation of his *Lexilogus* into English is in a state of considerable forwardness.*

Again, in *ἀάβαντοι*, Buttman has given, in a very few words, a far more satisfactory account of its formation and meaning, than Stephanus and all his editors together; and yet we have drily 'Cfr. Buttmani Lexil. i. 233;' the obvious interpretation of the brief hint being that Buttman's opinion would be found confirmatory of what had gone before; whereas, in this and many other instances, it is *decidedly the contrary*.

The same may be said of *ἀβληχρός*, *ἀγοστέω*, *ἄγρα*, *αἰδέλος*, *ἄητος* and *αἴητος*, of *ἀδέω*, etc. under the last of which words we find the following curious recommendation, 'Buttm. Lexil. cujus totum legas,' etc. etc. One should almost be inclined to suppose that the editors were ignorant of Buttman's work being written in German. If not, they must suppose the generality of their readers to understand that language: and this idea would seem to be confirmed by their having copied '*Ἀγοκῆ-προν*' from Schneider's *Lexicon*, and given the whole explanation in German,—either not taking the trouble, or not thinking it necessary to translate it. Indeed, unless it were translated better than that of '*Ἀγωνιστικός*' is, it were better left undone. They say—

Ἀγωνιστικός ap. Galen. et recentiores medicos, Strenuus, Fortis, Audax, Momentum habens: Schneid. Lex.

Schneider's interpretation is, in fact, *bold and decisive*; a meaning which it would be difficult to collect from the vague epithets of the Parisian editors.†

* Buttman's *Lexilogus* is a most able disquisition on the derivation, formation, and meaning of a number of doubtful words and passages in Homer, and contains, in two small unpretending volumes, a deeper and more critical knowledge of Greek, more extensive research, and more sound judgment, than we ever remember to have seen in any one work before. Though it is primarily a criticism on Homer, yet it is not confined to his poems; for every author, and every passage, and every analogy which the whole range of Greek literature can furnish as illustration or example, is brought to bear on the old epic language with a talent and by a memory surpassed (if surpassed) only in Porson himself.

† [Nearly two pages of similar examples of deficiency are here omitted.—ED. OF BIBL. REPOS.]

But it is unnecessary to pursue this examination further: from the extracts which we have given, our readers will be able to judge for themselves. These gentlemen may yet, if they will listen to advice, and profit by experience, go a great way towards retrieving the character of their work. The unfortunate plan which they have adopted will always be a great obstacle to their best exertions; but still, by care and accuracy, they may make up for much imperfection, and leave a monument of their talents and industry, creditable to themselves, and generally useful to Greek literature.*

* Since writing the above, we have seen the fourth number of the Paris Thesaurus, which, to our surprise, is not an immediate continuation of the former three numbers, but the commencement of the letter *B*, and not compiled by the same editors. M. Hase, indeed, it seems, still superintends the whole; but while his former associates are continuing their labours in *A*, two new coadjutors, Messrs William and Louis Dindorf, have produced the first number of *B*. We have looked through this number as carefully as the time would permit, and have to congratulate M. Hase on a very considerable improvement. Had the three earlier numbers been managed with equal care and judgment, much of the censure which we have thought it our painful duty to inflict would have been spared. The Messrs Dindorf have skilfully dovetailed some very excellent emendations and additions into the original matter. A little more concentration and abridgement might have been better; but the improvement is such that we must be satisfied with the present, and look forward to the future with the hope of its further increase. M. Hase, too, comes but seldom on the stage with his ecclesiastical quotations, and Ast's Plato has entirely disappeared; we hope, is not entirely neglected. We would hope, too, that the Messrs Dindorf will not overlook Passow's lexicon as their predecessors have done. Etymology they seem to have almost forgotten. The purchasers of the Thesaurus, will, therefore, learn with pleasure, that by contraction and concentration of matter this number contains nearly twice as much—or, we should rather say, advances nearly twice as far in the same number of pages, as either of the former three. Still, however, computing the length of the work by the diminished scale of this number, it will be, at least, twice as long as the Prospectus gave reason to expect; nor do we see how it can be brought at all within anything like the promised size, without injury to the work, unless, the plan be altered so as to omit all those hundreds of names of persons and places, most of them quite uninteresting, which now occupy so large a space. And then, after all, what between the different relays of editors, and their different modifications of the original plan, what an incongruous whole must poor Stephanus become!

We come now to the Greek and English Lexicon, which stands last at the head of our article, and which we have placed there for two reasons, principally for its connexion with the Greek and German lexicography, but also because it is the best specimen that we have seen of a Greek and English lexicon—which, unfortunately, is saying little for it. Of this work two editions have been published—the first in 1826, the second in 1831—of both it will be necessary to speak somewhat in detail. We will begin with the former. When we first heard of a *lexicon taken from Schneider*, we were on the tip-toe of expectation, knowing the intrinsic excellence of our German friend, whom we had been in the habit of consulting for some years. As soon as we had possession of our new prize, we naturally turned to the title-page, and there, to our great astonishment, we read, ‘A new Greek and English Lexicon, principally on the plan of the Greek and German Lexicon of Schneider.’—On the plan of Schneider!!! The *only* point of similarity between Donnegan's and Schneider's lexicons, as far as we have been able to discover, is in neither of them having any particular plan or arrangement at all. If there be any difference, it is in favour of Schneider, who *does* sometimes divide and number the different meanings of a word, and occasionally traces the derivative sense from the primitive. Donnegan never numbers the different significations of a word: he has indeed two marks which seem to denote some difference of signification, viz. a semicolon and a dash (thus—); but these marks are used so indiscriminately, with such want of decision and knowledge, or of care, that we can never be sure what they are intended to denote. They are sometimes placed between different meanings, sometimes between modifications of the same meaning, and sometimes between meanings in which there is no difference at all. We need not give instances of this—for they are to be found in almost every page. But Dr Donnegan did see in Schneider's want of plan one very considerable inconvenience, which he has avoided—only to fall into another as great if not greater. He says in his preface:

‘Schneider, by intermingling examples, critical remarks, and etymological observations, with the significations of his words, has frequently separated the various meanings to such a distance from each other that they are with difficulty traceable.’

To obviate this inconvenience, Dr Donnegan gives the different meanings in uninterrupted succession, and afterwards adds,

at the end of each article, (where he thinks it necessary,) some examples, with a translation of each, to explain or illustrate any striking or peculiar meanings. Now we find this plan quite as inconvenient as Schneider's confusion, and more unsatisfactory, to say nothing of its adding unnecessarily to the size of the lexicon; because, in this case, either the same meaning must be repeated, first as an interpretation of the word, and then annexed to the quotation*—or the quotation itself must be always translated, a thing generally unnecessary when it follows close on the signification of which it is the authority. For the student who consults Donnegan, if not fully satisfied with his interpretation of a word, as given generally without any authority affixed to it, must proceed to wade through a string of sentences in search of authority or explanation, where he finds no distinguishing mark to point out with which meaning each quotation is connected, and of which it is an illustration or peculiarity. If Donnegan had chosen to adopt this plan, he should have imitated the example of Ainsworth, in his Latin and English Dictionary, which we are sometimes inclined to think as good as any. Had he done so, marking each distinct set of meanings 1, 2, 3, etc. and then each authority or quotation 1, 2, 3, etc. as they referred respectively to each meaning, the student might have easily cast his eyes from the one to the other, as we have all done in Ainsworth, with ease and convenience.

Or should it be said that Schneider's *plan*, as adopted by Donnegan, consists (we still quote from the title page) in 'distinguishing such words as are poetical, of dialectic variety, or peculiar to certain writers or classes of writers,'—we answer, that though there may be here and there instances of such distinction marked both in Schneider and Donnegan, yet these instances are so few and far between, so rare in comparison of what they might and ought to be, that they would seem to have come there more by some lucky chance than from any regular plan or system. In Schneider, indeed, we are frequently able to ascertain, to a certain extent, what expressions are poetical or prosaic by the authorities given: but this is an advantage of course less frequent in Donnegan, where the authorities are scattered with a much more sparing hand. So much for Donnegan's *plan*.

* Should any one wish to see this plan of Donnegan most absurdly exemplified, let him consult his lexicon, second edition, at *Ἀνέκδοτα*.

And next, a little as to the matter. To Schneider, he fairly confesses, in his first preface, that his lexicon is indebted for its most valuable matter; but he, at the same time, assures us,

‘that in collecting materials for this first edition, neither time nor labour has been spared; the classical Greek writers have been carefully studied, the works of eminent lexicographers consulted, and information sought in the writings of the most celebrated critics and philosophers of our own and of neighbouring countries.’

This sounds well: but where are the fruits of the preface writer's labour and research? We have not met with them in any one page of his book. We have carefully examined a very large portion of his lexicon, comparing it article by article, and page by page, with Schneider—and we will venture to assert that, while almost every error, mistake, or defect of Schneider is too faithfully copied, everything *worth having*, which Donnegan's boasted researches have added to the valuable matter of Schneider, might be put in a nut-shell,—aye, and leave room enough for the kernel. Dr Donnegan entitles his book, ‘A new Greek and English Lexicon, *principally on the plan of the Greek and German Lexicon of Schneider*,’ etc. but a more correct title would have been, ‘An abridged translation of Schneider, with a few alterations and additions adding little or nothing to the value of the original.’ As a translation, we should say that, in very ordinary cases, it is pretty faithfully done, but that in points of the least doubt or difficulty (and of course these are of constant occurrence) it is extremely faulty and defective. We should say that Dr Donnegan has a sufficient command of English for ordinary matters, and a general knowledge of German, quite enough for the adequate rendering of any common work; and that as for his Greek—wherever an accurate or critical knowledge of the language is necessary; wherever there is required a nice discrimination of the force of particles or prepositions—an acquaintance with the analogies, or a philosophical view of the internal structure of the language;—there either Dr Donnegan's Greek breaks down under him, and leads him into sad mistakes, or (which is most generally the case) he leaves the difficulty as he found it. We must do him the justice to say that he does not seem conceited of his own powers, for he almost always follows Schneider most implicitly; but where he does venture to throw his original aside and trust to himself, we have invariably reason to regret that he has done so. In one respect, however, it were to be wished that the writer of

the magniloquent preface above quoted had not always trusted to Schneider; it were to be wished that, in composing his lexicon, he had made a point of consulting and examining the original Greek authors, and comparing *them* with the German interpretations, rather than contenting himself with rendering at once from the *German lexicographer*; if he had done so, he might have avoided numberless inaccuracies and mistranslations,* of which he has been guilty—he could not have perpetuated, as he has done, all the mistakes of Schneider—and above all, he would not have loaded so many of his articles with an accumulation of unnecessary meanings.

But let us now come to the second edition. It is evident, from every page and line of Dr Donnegan's first edition, that he had never seen Passow's lexicon, although the first part of it appeared as early as 1819, and the English lexicon not until 1826. But in this second edition, Dr Donnegan has had the advantage of Passow's labours. One thing, however, rather puzzles us: we hardly know whether Donnegan understood Passow's system of arrangement or not. That he did not see its value, or appreciate it as he might, we are quite sure, both from the way in which he speaks of it in his second preface, (if indeed he does speak of it there, of which we are far from clear,) and because *he has only followed it in the former half of his re-edited lexicon*. The latter half, from *A* inclusive, is, as to anything like arrangement, precisely as Schneider left it. But more of this hereafter. Let us first see what account Donnegan himself gives in his preface, of the improvement of this second edition. 'Attention,' he says, 'has been most particularly directed to correct any deviation from the natural or philosophical arrangement of the meanings of words.' Now, who would imagine from this that Donnegan's first edition was composed without the slightest regard to, or knowledge of, any natural or philosophical arrangement whatever; and that this second edition, (or rather the first half of it,) is drawn up with slavish fidelity on that most admirable and systematic arrangement of Passow, which we have a few pages back described? We are justified, therefore, in saying, when he penned this preface he either did not understand the plan he was adopting, or contrived so to write as to take to him-

* And yet what hope is there of one who, from poverty of mind, or want of language, can translate the *ἀγαπὸς γάμος* of the *Œdip. Tyrannus*, by 'unhappily married,' and the *δοικὸς εἰσολήτης* of the *Philoctetes*, by 'an unfortunate dwelling?'

self the merit due to Passow. But in truth we cannot pass over, without censuring, in the strongest language we are capable of, Dr Donnegan's most unfair and unhandsome conduct in not having *distinctly acknowledged* the advantages which he has derived from Passow's lexicon. He has adopted Passow's arrangement—copied—translated from him as he had done before from Schneider—and yet never had the honesty to give the slightest acknowledgment. It is true that the name of Passow occurs in a few scattered instances, (under *ἄγκυρα*, for example,) but then in so short and unintelligible a manner as to be hardly observable; and so very rarely does even this occur, that any one who recognizes the name of Passow could only suppose that Donnegan had borrowed from him a few scattered hints, instead of having made his lexicon the foundation of his second edition. Is this fair or honourable? Is it like a gentleman or a scholar? Again, he says,—

'Above 200 pages of entirely new matter have been added to the present edition. Half the work has been re-written, and **THE ENTIRE newly modelled**, in conformity with the *general plan*, but with much improvement and simplification in the details.'

We are very sorry to say, the truth, and the whole truth is, that Donnegan has *re-written and re-modelled only the first half of this second edition*, altering, and amending, and enlarging it *after Passow*, of whom it is now almost as exact an abridged translation as the first edition was of Schneider—excepting in some articles, where the one is added to the other, and where, accordingly, between both, much superfluous interpretation and almost inextricable confusion are necessarily produced.* Now,

* As an instance of the bungling manner in which Dr Donnegan compounds a mixture of Schneider and Passow, we copy, word for word, from his second edition, the following:—

'*ἄσπετος*, *ov*, adj. that cannot be injured or violated, inviolable, *Il.* 14, 271. as an epithet of the waters of *Styx*, the sanction of an inviolable oath—invulnerable, invincible, *Apoll.* 2. 77. not injurious, irreproachable, hence honourable, worthy, viz. a contest, *Ody.* 21, 91. and 22, 5. *Schn. L. Supplem.* or in the first sense irrevocable or decisive as to the result, *Schn. L. ed. Pass.* injurious, or highly injurious, *Apollon.* 1, 459. ¶ In *Ody.* 21, 91. s. s. as *πολυβλαβής*, from the force of the double *a* or a *augm.* or for *ἄγαν*, *Eustath.* yet in *Ody.* 21, 91. perhaps invincible, or difficult to be achieved, for *Antinous* adds *ὃν γὰρ*, &c. for I do not think that this well-polished bow can be easily strung. *Ody.* 22, 5. innocuous, relatively to that which was to follow, viz. the attack on the

of the '200 pages of entirely new matter,' or to speak accurately, of the 219 pages by which this second edition exceeds the first, 211 are contained in the former half to *K* inclusive, and the latter half is 'increased by only the remaining eight: and so far from this latter having been 'newly modelled, in conformity with the general plan,'—(Qu. what is this plan?)—there are not a dozen alterations, or amendments, or corrections, through the whole of it, excepting in the beginning of each letter, and in the particles and prepositions, which are greatly enlarged, but always 'duce et auspice' Passow. Why Dr Donnegan stopped short after he had re-modelled the half of his work,—why he published it thus imperfect, may perhaps puzzle the uninitiated; but we have no doubt that the simple fact is,—a second edition was wanted when only the half had been re-written; and we venture to guess that a third edition is *now* in hand, in which the latter half will one day appear corresponding with the former. In this there would have been nothing to blame, had the preface told us exactly how the matter stood; but it remains for Dr Donnegan to explain how he dared to talk of his lexicon as being 'entirely re-modelled,' when, in fact, only one half of the work had been so dealt with!

sailors. † *Damm* gives as primary sense, undeceiving, and so understands it *Ody.* 21, 91, and ironically, 22, 5. deriving it from α priv. ἄτος. Th. α priv. ἄτάω from ἄάω, or α priv. ἄάω, Buttmann *Lexil.* s. 231.

Again—

ἄατος, ου, adj. s. s. as ἄάτος, highly injurious, *Apollon.* 1, 459. see ἄάτος. Th. (in the latter sense) α augm. ἄάω to injure. † ἄατος or ἄτος, insatiable, *Hes. Theog.* 714. and *Sc. Herc.* 55, and 101. with a genit. Th. (ἄάω) ἄω, to satiate. † s. s. as ἄητος from ἄημι, ἄω, to blow.

It would be waste of time and paper to criticise such a mishmash of sense and nonsense as this. We will rather give what a very little common sense and a very moderate knowledge of Greek might (with the help of Passow and Buttmann) have easily produced:—

ἄατος, ὁ, ἦ, (Th. ἄάω, to hurt,) that cannot be hurt with impunity, inviolable, *Il.* ξ, 271. That cannot be overcome or accomplished without difficulty, *Ody.* φ, 91. ζ, 5. But Buttmann, in his *Lexil.* I. p. 232, understands the word, in all three passages, more in a moral sense, as what ought not to be hurt or violated—ought not to be treated with slight or contempt. In *Apoll. Rh.* 2, 77, it is used in the former sense of invulnerable, invincible.

ἄατος, ὁ, ἦ, contr. ἄτος, (Th. ἄω, ἄσαι, to satiate,) insatiable, *ποσειδων*, *Hes. Theog.* 714. *Scut.* 59. ἄατος is for ἄητος, *Quint. Sm.* 1, 217.

It would be unnecessary to go into detail through all the improvements and corrections which Donnegan has made in this his second edition. Suffice it to say, that for all of them (and they are really numerous and considerable) he is indebted to Passow; so that, instead of calling the book a *second edition of Donnegan's lexicon*, we should term the former half of it an abridged translation of Passow, and the latter an abridged translation of Schneider.

But now comes the main question. Has Donnegan made the most of the advantages furnished him either by Schneider or by Passow? we must answer decidedly in the negative. His lexicon is full of inaccuracies and faults, and some of them are so radical, that nothing less than an entire and careful examination of the whole, with a constant reference to the original authors, and a re-modelling and re-writing of every article of any length, by a more skilful hand than Donnegan's, can ever thoroughly correct it. The main and constantly recurring faults are—

1st. Mis-translations of Schneider's and Passow's German, and a frequent want of precision in giving the exact meaning of a word or of a quotation.

2nd. An unnecessary number of meanings, either by the use of many synonymous words, by refining too much on the real meaning, and thus frittering it away, by giving too vague* and general an interpretation, or by expressing qualities which may be in the thing signified, but are not in the *sense* of the word.†

These striking defects might have been avoided—and could only have been so—by carefully examining the original authors—

* For instance βαρυνής ought to have some more definite meaning than 'grievous, distressing, Soph. Œ. C. 1561.' The same may be said of βαρύθυμος. Again, Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1098, calls arrows, πικρὰ ἔχρη, winged spears. But this does not justify the German lexicographer, nor his copyist Donnegan, in giving as a meaning of ἔχρη, a weapon in general.

† We point to such words as ἀστομος, rendered by Donnegan, 'unpalatable—bitter, acid, tasteless.' These three last interpretations are not the meaning of the word. A thing which is ἀστομος, unpalatable, may be acid or lusciously sweet, or bitter, or sour, or tasteless,—but these qualities, though either of them may exist in the thing signified, are not, therefore, in the word. [This is one of the chief sources of the great multiplication of meanings, which Schleusner and other lexicographers have assigned to words in the New Testament; that is, they have transferred to the word an idea which lies only in its adjuncts. See Schleusner passim. Ed. or B. R.]

which the preface says the Doctor had done ! In proof of our assertions, we need only turn over a few pages, and we find,—

“*Ἀβοῦαι*—without noise or struggle, Pind. Nem. 8, 15.” It should be, without a summons or invitation.

“*Ἀβουκόλητος*,—inconsiderate, not circumspect, Æschyl. Supp. 942.” It should be, disregarded.

Ἀγάζομαι and *ἄγαμαι* are not, strictly speaking, ‘to wonder at,’ but to admire ; and so Schneider and Passow render them, but Donnegan has mistaken *bewundern* for *verwundern*.

“*Ἀγαλματοφορέω*,—to carry a statue, or as a statue is carried.” It should be, literally, to carry a statue, but generally used metaphorically, *τινα αἶν. to carry the image of a person in the mind* : Philo passim.

“*Ἀγευστος* does not signify in Xen. Mem. ‘inexperienced, unenjoyed, or untried.’ It is precisely the same expression and the same meaning as Donnegan had before given, and for which he had quoted as his authority Soph. Ant. 583. The one is *ἄγευστος κακῶν*, the other *ἄγ. τερονῶν*, not having tasted or experienced. Donnegan did not see the distinction between the active and the passive meaning of this word.

Ἀγλατά is not at Ody. 17, 244, nor elsewhere, that we have ever heard of, ‘arrogance or insolence.’ In that passage it is, festive revelling.

Ἀγλαΐζω is not in ‘Theocr. Epig. 1, 4, to decorate with a laurel crown.’ The sentence is, The Delphic Rock *τοῦτο τοῖς αἰγλαΐσις*, made this splendid for thee, produced it to decorate thee,—the literal meaning of the word being to *make splendid*.

Ἀγνοέω.—Donnegan has translated Il. β. 807, “*Ἐκτορ δ’ οὐκ θεῆς ἔπος ἠγνοίησεν*, ‘he attended not to the word of the goddess.’ And from this passage, and Schneider’s translation of it in the supplement to his lexicon, he has given as one of the meanings of *ἠγνοέω*, ‘not to follow.’ Had he examined Homer, and not blindly translated from Schneider, who is frequently much too free in his interpretations, he would have seen that there is no occasion for travelling out of the plain road to find the sense of this passage : it is the common meaning of the word, *not to know, not to understand*. Hector was not ignorant of what the goddess meant, but fully understood it. This interpretation explains the passage intelligibly, and is in perfect accordance with the other lines in which Homer uses it.

As to the second defect which we mentioned, that of giving an unnecessary number of meanings, we may see it exem-

plified in *Ἀγῆνωρ*,* under which we find no less than thirteen (not different meanings, but) different words of interpretation for Homer and Pindar; as thus—'most manly, brave, valiant, courageous, noble—Pindar; haughty, arrogant, insolent, daring, rash, headstrong; strong—Ody.; great—Pindar'!!! We pity the unfortunate school-boy who is expected to form some precise idea of the sense of *Ἀγῆνωρ* from this heterogeneous mixture of similar and dissimilar meanings. What must he think of the vagueness and inaccuracy of ancient Greek? It is enough to disgust him with it forever. Of these thirteen interpretations, there is not one which fully and truly expresses the meaning of the word. *High-spirited* will perhaps come nearest to it, and will suit every passage in the *Iliad*, and many in the *Odyssey*; and where, in the latter, it is used in a sense rather vituperative, as applied to the suitors, we may render it by *licentious*. In Pindar, it is used as the epithet of a high-spirited horse, and thence metaphorically applied to *things*, as being 'exceedingly (*ἄγαν*) splendid or magnificent,' e. g. *πλουῖτος, μισθός, κόμπος*.

Again *ἄγνός* is rendered by Donnegan,

'meriting worship or veneration: hence, glorious, honourable, as a contest is, Pind.; sacred to the gods, holy as a festival, Ody. 21. 259; not to be approached by the profane, Soph. *CE.* C. 38; undefiled, pure, in a physical or moral sense, chaste, virginal, an epithet of Diana and Proserpine, Ody. 11, 385; morally good or irreproachable.'

Now multiply and subdivide as we will, *ἄγνός* can have but two meanings,—the first, sacred or holy; the second, free from all moral or physical impurity, i. e. pure and chaste. All be-

* The origin of this would seem to be, that Donnegan, having too often no precise and definite idea of the meaning of a Greek word, is fearful that, in translating from the German lexicographer, he may omit any of its meanings, and therefore gives every sense and signification which the German words can by possibility bear; in doing which he wanders widely from the meaning of the original Greek. There is a ludicrous instance of his ignorance in '*Ἀποκαθεύδω*, to sleep separately; to sleep out of one's house—to be fond of sleep—to sleep upon—sleep with another.' Only the two first are legitimate significations; whence the third came we cannot conjecture; the fourth is a false translation of Schneider's *über etwas einschlafen*, i. e. to fall asleep in the midst of doing a thing: the fifth is a false deduction from Schneider's quotation, *ἀποκαθευθε παρ' αὐτῆς*, he *slept away from his own house*, i. e. at the sick person's.—Philostr. *Apoll.* 8, 7, 14.

yond this is unnecessary, and can only serve to puzzle rather than explain.

If it were necessary, we might go on with *ἀβρός, ἀγνώμων, ἀστεμφής, ἀστειός, ἀστειός, ἀφοβός*, etc.* But we have done, and will close our remarks by confessing that the predominant feeling of our mind, throughout this examination of Donnegan, has been disappointment,—disappointment that with such materials before him, with such aids as Schneider and Passow might and ought to have been to him, he has not done more ; or, rather, has done what he has done so imperfectly ; that, setting out on the great principle of the absurdity of tracing the sense of one language through the medium of another into a third, he has been himself guilty of that very absurdity—guilty of translating from the German instead of the Greek, and thus making that the principal which ought to have been only an auxiliary, and hardly deigning to call in, even as auxiliaries, those who ought to have been principals. The consequences are, what must be always the consequences of such an unnatural order of proceeding, inaccuracy, defectiveness, and superfluity. And the sum of all, that which has given the keenest edge to our disappointment, is, that the misfortune must be, we fear, in this case, nearly irremediable—that future editions must increase rather than diminish the evil, for they cannot amend the inherent defects, nor remove faults ingrafted in the very ground-work of this Greek and English lexicon. Instead of serving, as we had hoped when we first saw it announced for publication, as a foundation on which to raise a goodly structure of Greek and English lexicography, it is so innately unsound, that whatever is raised on it must partake largely of its faults. Nothing but its being completely remodelled, and managed on a different plan and in a different manner, will ever make it extensively or permanently useful.

Having thus given an account of the different lexicons placed at the head of our article, and pointed out the merits and defects of each, we must sum up the whole, and endeavour to attain the great object which we have all along kept in view, by giving an outline of such a Greek and English lexicon as we

* It would be wearying ourselves and our readers unnecessarily to make any extracts from, or throw away any criticism on, the latter half of Donnegan's Lexicon ; it has all the imperfections of Schneider's want of arrangement, in addition to those which we have mentioned of the former half.

would wish to see undertaken, being fully convinced that unless one be formed on this or some very similar plan, it cannot but fail.

We should begin then by saying, that we prefer the alphabetical arrangement of words to the etymological one, where the derivatives are arranged under their primitives. The latter may be the more philosophical, but every one knows that it is most inconvenient, while the former is the only one calculated for general use, and may be so managed—(the roots and the primitives being, for instance, placed in larger characters than the derivatives)—as to present almost all the advantages without any of the inconveniences of the former.

It should be an invariable rule in this commencement of a new line of lexicography, never to admit a meaning for which there is not some good and undoubted authority, and to affix to each meaning the authority on which it rests, or the passage from which it is drawn: of course, the earliest or best author should be preferred. By setting out on this plan, and regularly adhering to it, we shall be laying the only sure foundation for avoiding errors and mistranslations at first; for discovering and correcting them when made: and preventing that endless multiplication of meanings, many of them tautologous or false, which now deluge our dictionaries, and only go on increasing with every fresh edition. It would then be seen, at the first glance, what authority there is for any sense; and should the inquirer question the fidelity or skill of the lexicographer, he could satisfy his doubts by referring to the author himself. If it be said, that a lexicon formed on such a plan as this would be too cumbrous and too expensive for general use, we answer, that the plan proposed is the only one calculated for preventing a lexicon becoming too extensive, by excluding everything not absolutely necessary; and that from a work of this kind would be formed, very soon and very easily, abridged editions to suit younger students and all who are willing to rely on the judgment of others, while the greater work would remain for more advanced scholars who think and examine for themselves. Besides, this part of the plan might be so modified, with very little or no injury to the work, or inconvenience to those who use it, that all apprehension of its too great bulk would vanish at once. For instance, in all common and useful meanings, where there can be no doubt, and where the author from whom the authority is taken is in every one's hands, as Homer, Xenophon, etc.

a reference to the passage would be sufficient; in all unusual meanings, and where the author is not of every day use, it would be better to give the example at length.

Every word should have its root attached to it, and, if possible, in such a way that both should be seen at the same glance; and if the quantity be marked, it will be a great additional convenience and advantage. The best general plan which we have seen for combining both these very desirable points is that of Passow. In his work, the root is added in curved brackets immediately after the word; and the quantity of the doubtful vowel or vowels is marked, wherever it is possible, over the word itself—as in Maltby's Thesaurus; but where this is prevented by the accent, it is added at the end of the article in square brackets, as thus:—

Ἀδύιος, ὁ, ῆ, (α priv. and *δύιος*) not hostile, etc. [—]

Where the derivation, being doubtful or disputed, is too long to be placed conveniently near the beginning of an article, Passow has, we think judiciously, reversed the respective situations of the root and quantity, thus:—

Διάκτορος, ὁ, ῆ, [—] a servant, etc.

(The common derivation is *διά* and *κόνις*, one who goes in haste through the dust; compare *ἐγκονέω*: or one who sleeps in the dust and ashes of the hearth, as the lowest hinds did (Odys. xi, 190): or, with a more general idea, one whose occupations necessarily lead him through dust and dirt. But Buttmann, in his *Lexilogus*, makes it very probable, on prosodiocal grounds, that an old verb, *διάκω*, *διήκω*, whence also *διώκω*, lies at the root of this word, which verb had the meaning of, to run, hasten; and that *διάκτορος* is a derivation from the same root, and not a compound).

We think if this outline were filled up according to the rules which we will now enumerate, a lexicon might in time be produced equal to our most sanguine expectations.

The rules, then, which we propose, are these:—

1st. To give, wherever, and as far as a word will admit of it, its different meanings in chronological order, tracing them from Homer, Hesiod, or the earliest author in which such word or meaning occurs.*

* Observe, we say, 'whenever a word will admit of this.' We are aware that if we were to attempt to explain the senses of every word in any language by following universally and systematically the chronological order of its appearances in books, we should be frequently

2d. Where there is no decisive change of meaning traceable in the different eras of the language, to give first the primitive or literal sense, whether in an earlier or later author, and then the derivative senses, tracing them from one to the other so as to mark as clearly as possible their connexion with the primitive and with each other.

3d. To notice whether a word has varied in its construction in different authors, or in different periods of the language.

4th. To mark where a word is a dialectic variety, and whether it is used principally by the epic poets, by the dramatic writers, or by the Attic prose authors.

5th. Those primitive forms of verbs, for which we have no positive authority in the remaining works of the elder Greek authors, but which are found perhaps in the lexicons of the grammarians, or of which there remain only some tenses now generally ranked as irregular under a later form, should be mentioned as such in their proper alphabetical places; and the tenses formed from them, though placed under the form in general use, might be always referred back to their original thema.

We are aware that, to form a lexicon on these rules, would be a work of time and labour, requiring most extensive and accurate learning, sound judgment, and unwearied perseverance; but at the same time we are quite convinced that these rules are

led into the most glaring absurdities. Numerous instances of this may be seen in the English Dictionary which forms part of the Encyclopædia Metropolitana, where this system is blindly followed, by a diligent, and, in many other respects, praiseworthy writer, in tracing the English language from the earliest writers down to the usage of the present day. In Greek, these absurdities might not be of such frequent occurrence, on account of the three great epochs which stand out so prominently in the history of that language, nor would they be so striking in a dead as in a living tongue; still it would be ridiculous to say that Homer *always* used *every* word found in his writings in the primitive or literal sense; and of course instances must often occur of words used figuratively, or in a secondary sense, by earlier writers, and by later authors in their simple or primitive one. In the Encyclopædia Metropolitana, we find, for instance, the *first* meaning of the word 'embattled,' taken from a line in Chaucer, who employs it as the epithet of a cock's comb—a meaning which common sense tells us is a metaphorical usage, and ought therefore to be preceded by the simple one, whether that be found in *Havelok the Dane*, or in *The Spectator*. Passow's whole lexicon is a striking and beautiful illustration of this rule, and of the limits within which it should be restricted.

not more than sufficient—that, with the numerous helps which a scholar has in the present day, they are not of greater difficulty than he may be fairly required to encounter—and that a lexicon, not founded on these or similar rules, must be in some point or other radically defective. We will give an instance or two of each of these rules, partly to exemplify our meaning, but still more to show how necessary they are, and how useful they may be made.

As an instance of the effect of the *first* of these rules we might point to *ἄγαλμα*, the Homeric sense of which is *πᾶν ἐφ' ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται*, any object of exultation, pride, or delight; its post-Homeric and general Attic sense, *the statue of any god or deified hero*: nor was it ever applied to statues of men, until, by the flattery of the later Greeks, under the Byzantine emperors. In the same way we cannot obtain a clear knowledge of the different meanings of *ἀγαπάω*, and its more poetical form *ἀγαπάς*, but by tracing it from the Homeric sense, 'to show a person any act of favour, affection, or kindness,' down to its common Attic meaning, 'to be fond of inanimate things,' as *πλουῦτον, χρήματα*, etc. and thence again to Lucian's frequent use of it for sexual love, *ἐρᾶω*—in which sense it is not found except in writers of a very late era. Now, in putting this rule into practice, we shall observe that there are three great epochs in the language, through all or some of which the different meanings of a word can be frequently traced with more or less distinctness; viz. its infancy, its prime, and its decline:—its infancy in the heroic age of Homer, with whom we may join Hesiod—its prime, in the pure and classical times of Thucydides, Xenophon, and the great dramatists—and its decline, after the Macedonian conquest, and still later under the rising star of Roman greatness, when such writers as Polybius, Plutarch, and Lucian disfigured the elegant language of Plato and Sophocles by spurious expressions, foreign idioms, and new-fangled meanings. The greater number of instances, however, will give only two epochs—as in *κόσμος*, of which the Homeric meanings are, 'order or regularity,' and 'any ornamental part of dress;' but its other, and secondary meaning, 'the regular system of the universe, the world,' did not exist until some centuries after, when Pythagoras first introduced it as a philosophical expression, (vid. Bentley's *Opusc. Philolog.* p. 347, 445), from whom it was adopted by Parmenides, Empedocles, and others, and so passed into common usage. Of course one very essential part of this rule is, that in

every instance, whether there be a *chronological* variety of meaning or not, the earliest author in which a word or meaning occurs should be always noticed—as, for instance, under *ἄγρυπα*, it must be mentioned that the earliest occurrence of the word is in Pindar, while Homer always uses *εὐναί*. We might enumerate a vast number of other words which can never be clearly understood but by taking such a chronological view of their meanings; but what we have given will be amply sufficient, and not perhaps too much, to illustrate every part of this most important rule—by a strict observance of which, wherever practicable, we shall in time possess a complete and philosophical knowledge of the different stages of the language, and shall be enabled to ascertain with much more ease and certainty than by any other means, what families of words and meanings are genuine Hellenic, what have crept into the language in the Macedonian and Alexandrian eras, and what were introduced by the Romans, Byzantines, and others, until the final corruption of the language. We have said the more on the various branches of this rule, because we believe it to be quite new to most of our classical readers, as we know of no instance of its having been brought into practice until in Passow's lexicon, of which it forms the most striking and most valuable feature. On the other rules we shall have to say comparatively little.

Of the *second* rule, it may be hardly necessary to give an example; it will not, however, detain us long, and we will venture on one in

Ἀποτροφή, ἡ, (*ἀποστρέφω*) *the turning anything from or away*—as the averting of an evil, of an accusation, of a crime, etc. Eurip. Hippol. 1036. The turning of a horse short aside, Xen. de Equ. 9, 6. Vide *Ἀποτροπή*.

2. In a passive or middle sense, *the turning of oneself from one thing or place to another*, as through fear, whence, a place of refuge or safety, like *καταφυγή*, Herodot. 8, 109. Xen. Anab. 2, 4, 11. Eurip. Med. 603. *Ἀπ. σωτηρίας*, Thucyd. 8, 75; or through want, as a resource, *ὑδατος*, Herodot. 2, 13; or, through dislike, whence aversion, defection, or revolt, Plut. Alcib. 14; or, simply, the being turned in a different direction, as the bend or turn of a road or river, *τοῦ ὁδύματος*, Plut. Lucull. 27; or, *that which turns from one thing to another*, a diversion, Plut. vol. vi. 504, Reiske. In Rhet. the figure *Apostrophe*.*

* Observe, in exemplification of our caution as to the application of our first rule in a preceding note, that the first usage of this word is here taken from Euripides; the second from a much earlier writer—Herodotus.

On the *third* rule we need say but little, as it is obvious that, whether a word vary in meaning or remain the same, in different periods or different authors, yet in its syntax it may undergo great changes. For instance, *κοιρανέω* has always the same meaning, yet its construction varies greatly. Homer never joins it immediately with a case, but uses it either absolutely, as at II. β, 207, or more frequently with *κατά* and the accusative, as *πόλεμον κατά*, *Λυκίην κατά*, etc. the preposition being always after the substantive. On the contrary, Hesiod, in his Theog. 331, joins it with the genitive—Pindar Olymp. 14, 12. with the accusative—Apollon. Rhod. with the dative.

The *fourth* rule is one so plain and well-known, that it might seem superfluous to make any remark on it. And yet it must be observed, that to make it really efficient, it must be acted on regularly and systematically. We shall then reap from it advantages, of which, from its meagre use and rare occurrence in our present lexicons, we can now have no conception. Thus, of *ἅγιος* and *ἄγνός*, it may be said that *ἅγιος* is a much later word, and of a narrower meaning than *ἄγνός*; seldom found in the Attic prose writers—never in the tragedians; while *ἄγνός* is the Homeric form, and used by the Attic poets and orators. Again, of *δειλός* and *δellaίος*—the former is the Homeric form, and used also in Attic prose; the latter is never found in the epic poets, but constantly used by the tragedians. Again, of *δένδρον*, that its first appearance in this form is in Pindar—Homer always using *δένδρεον*; that the Ionians, whom the Attic poets sometimes follow, used *δένδρος*, τό, whence we find in Attic prose the dative plural *δένδρεσι*, as well as *δένδροις*: Thucyd. 2, 75. Xen. Œcon. 4, 14. Schaef. Greg. p. 61, 62, 265. Again, of the present *εἶμι*, to go, it may be remarked, that in Homer it frequently occurs as a real present, though he does use it also as a future; but that in Ionic prose, and in the Attic writers, it is, *with very few exceptions*, a real future; and that it does not revert back to the regular sense of a present until in such later authors as Pausanias and Plutarch;—which, however, holds good, strictly speaking, only of the indicative, next of the infinitive and participle: the Attics use it more frequently than *ἐλεύσομαι* and *πορεύσομαι*, Valcken. Hippol. 1065. Some isolated instances of *εἶμι*, with the sense of a present, in the best Attic writers, may be found in Herm. de Æsch. Danaid. p. 8. Such observations as these will show how extensively useful this rule may be made.

The *fifth* rule may require a little illustration to make our meaning clearly understood. Let us take for that purpose *ἀνδάνω*. We know that this has been the form in regular use from Homer's time, but we find it joined with a fut. *ἀθήσω*, an aor. 2, *ἄδον*, *ἄδειν*, and a perf. *ἔαδα*, which cannot be formed from *ἀνδάνω*, but must be traced back to another form *ἀδέω*, as to which, though we have no positive authority for it, we may yet fairly conclude either that it was in actual use at the time these tenses were first formed, or that those who formed them had good reasons for supposing its previous existence. Our rule, therefore, directs that *ἀδέω* should be admitted into the lexicon, and placed in its proper alphabetical situation, and that whether any authority for it be found among the grammarians or not, as thus,

Ἀδέω, to please : not used in pres. but supplies *ἀνδάνω* with fut. *ἀθήσω* ; aor. 2. *ἄδον* [~], *ἄδειν* ; perf. *ἔαδα*, Dor. *ἔαδα* [~~]

Again, *ἀνδάνω* would run thus :—

Ἀνδάνω, (*ἡδομαι*) imperf. *ἡνδανον*, and *ἐἡνδανον*, Hom.—Att. sometimes *ἰάνδανον*. From the obsolete form *ἀδέω* come a fut. *ἀθήσω*, Herodot. and Att. aor. *ἔαδον* ; besides which Homer has the aor. *εὔαδον*, which like *ἄδον* [~] is only poet.—Perf. *ἔαδα*, Dor. *ἔαδα*. To please, etc.

In the same way we should admit *τάω* as an obs. theme to form the poet. perf. *γέγαα* for *γέγονα*, perf. to *γλυνομαι*,—*τάω*, whence *δέδαα*,—*θάφω*, whence *τέθηπα*, and *ἐτάφον*,—and many others, the adoption or rejection of which must be left to the judgment of the lexicographer.

We have observed in Passow's lexicon a very simple and judicious way of marking the difference between the tenses formed regularly from the usual form and those formed from some other obsolete one. For instance, Passow would call *ἡνδανον* the imperfect of *ἀνδάνω*, but *ἀθήσω*, the future to *ἀνδάνω* ; the different particles expressing that the former is formed regularly from it, but that the latter is only joined with it and placed under it for convenience. A plan of the same kind might be introduced into our grammars and lexicons with singular advantage, as it would often impress on the minds of younger students an important distinction, which now too generally escapes observation, or passes off under the indefinite term of an irregularity.

We have been the more minute in illustrating these rules, be-

cause we are heartily ashamed of the present state of our lexicons and dictionaries—and, after the maturest consideration, feel convinced that the Greek language can never be studied as it deserves to be, nor fully understood, until we possess a lexicon formed on some such plan, and by some such rules, as we have drawn up. We are confident, that no Greek lexicon, unless conducted on such principles, will be of any extensive use to the classical world, or permanently redound to the credit of its author: whereas, if managed in the manner we have described, with suitable care and talent, it would prove an eternal monument of the learning and industry of its compilers, and soon throw into disuse all the editions of Stephanus, or Scapula, or Schneider, which ever have been or ever will be published.

ART. IV.—THE LAMENT OF DAVID OVER SAUL AND JONATHAN, II SAM. I. 19—27. TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY.

By the Editor.

INTRODUCTION.

The name of David is distinguished among the leaders of the Jewish theocracy, as “the man after God’s own heart.” As the magnanimous warrior and chivalrous chief; as the sweet Psalmist of Israel, pouring forth upon his harp strains to touch and melt the hearts of millions in every age and clime until the end of the world; he stands and will forever stand alone. Were we disposed to regard him merely as a warlike chief, there are in his history traits of magnanimity and romantic valour, which alone would have immortalized inferior men. Wit-

ness his daring combat with Goliath; his repeated forbearance to take the life of Saul when thrown into his power, when his heart smote him because he had cut off even Saul's skirt;* and his conduct when, on his longing to drink of the water of the well of Bethlehem,† three mighty men brake through the host of the Philistines and drew water from the well and brought it to him, yet he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord and said, 'Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should do this; is it not the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?' Or if we look at him as an inspired poet, he it is, above all others, who has expressed most fully the enjoyments and the longings, the complaints and the rejoicings, of the pious soul; so that his strains have ever been and ever will be adopted by all pious minds, as the fittest expression of their own feelings, and composed as it were expressly for themselves.‡

It is, however, not as the monarch of Israel or a prophet of the Lord, that we have now to do with him; but as a man, a friend, a fellow-mortal, in the social relations of private life. In this respect, there is no one of the distinguished men of the Old Testament, whose character the records of inspiration have so fully developed. It might be sufficient, perhaps, to refer only to that trait of frank, confiding generosity, which could overlook all injuries and embrace even former enemies as friends; as in the case of Saul above referred to; of Abner, for whom he wept as for a prince and a great man fallen in Israel;§ of Amasa;|| and likewise of the false and ungrateful Absalom, the deep moanings of a father's grief for whom, cannot be read without tears.¶ But our purpose draws us to dwell more particularly upon the tone of deep and confiding emotion and generous feeling, which made him the warmest of friends, and procured for him the most devoted attachment in return. We see this exemplified in several instances; but in none so strikingly as in the mutual affection of David and Jonathan,—a friendship than which none is more renowned in the history and poetry of the world.

It is not necessary here to dwell upon the circumstances of

* 1 Sam. c. 24. c. 26.

† 2 Sam. 23: 15 sq. 1 Chr. 11: 17 sq.

‡ Compare the language of Luther, as quoted by De Wette, *Bibl. Repos.* III. p. 450.

§ 2 Sam. 3: 31 sq.

|| 2 Sam. 19: 13.

¶ 2 Sam. 18: 5, 29 sq. 19: 1 sq.

this mutual attachment ; they cannot be depicted in brighter or more touching colours than the simple language of the sacred historian : "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul."* And when by the perverse jealousy and malignity of Saul, David was compelled to flee, and Jonathan had given him the concerted signal to this effect, "they kissed one another, and wept one with another, until David exceeded."† From this time onward, they appear to have met but once, when, during Saul's ungenerous pursuit of David, "Jonathan arose and went to David into the wood, and strengthened his hand in God ; and they two made a covenant before the Lord."‡ It was not long after, that David was called to give utterance to his feelings over the melancholy fate of Jonathan, in the exquisite elegy which we are about to consider ; and the strength and permanency of his affection was manifested by the constant personal interest which he afterwards took in Mephibosheth, the only remnant of the family of Jonathan, and by the generous provision which he made for his support.

The character of Jonathan appears to have been the reflex of that of David, full of deep and tender feeling, and of true affection under the most difficult circumstances. Indeed, the first advances in their friendship seem to have been chiefly on his part ; as was doubtless natural, he being the elder of the two, and a prince of the reigning family. If he had less of that bold and determined enterprise, which fits men to become successful chiefs and leaders, he was at least not wanting in that daring personal heroism which challenges the admiration of a people. This is manifest from his romantic and successful attack upon the Philistines' garrison at Michmash ;§ and that all Israel looked upon him as 'their beauty and their pride,' is evinced by the manner of their interference on that occasion, to prevent the fatal execution of the rash vow of Saul.||

A few words only need to be premised, respecting the circumstances of the battle in which Saul and his sons were slain, in order to illustrate some of the allusions in the following poem. The Philistines had gathered their armies together against Israel, and pitched in Shunem in the great plain of Esdraelon ;**

* 1 Sam. 18: 1. 20: 11 sq.

† 1 Sam. 20: 41.

‡ 1 Sam. 23: 16 sq.

§ 1 Sam. 14: 1 sq.

|| 1 Sam. 14: 24 sq. 45.

** 1 Sam. 28: 4.

while Saul gathered all Israel and pitched on the mountains of Gilboa, which skirt the plain on the east, and separate it from the valley of the Jordan. Saul at this time was in great dependency. The Lord had forsaken him, and answered him not; and in his distress he had rashly applied to the sorceress of Endor. There the spirit of Samuel had appeared to him and announced his fate: "The Lord will deliver Israel with thee into the hands of the Philistines; and tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me."* Saul returned the same night to his camp; in the meantime the Philistines had advanced in the plain to Aphek, while the Israelites descended from the mountain as far as to a fountain in the eastern part of the plain.† Here the battle commenced; with what feelings on the part of Saul may be imagined. "The Philistines fought against Israel; and the men of Israel fled from before the Philistines, and fell down slain in mount Gilboa."‡ The four sons of Saul, including Jonathan, were slain; and Saul himself wounded. What wonder, that in his anguish and despair, he should call upon his armour-bearer to slay him, or should himself fall upon his own sword? It was indeed a day of darkness and of calamity to Israel. The inhabitants of the adjacent cities forsook them and fled, and the Philistines came and dwelt in them.

The sad intelligence was brought to David and his companions at Ziklag, a place three days' journey from the plain of battle towards the South West.§ It was communicated by an Amalekite, who claimed to have slain Saul at his own request, and produced his crown and bracelet as tokens of the truth of his words.|| The blow was sudden, and probably unexpected. "Then David took hold on his clothes, and rent them; and likewise all the men that were with him. And they mourned

* 1 Sam. 28: 19.

† 1 Sam. 29: 1. Perhaps the fountain mentioned by Dr Richardson; see *Bibl. Repos.* I. p. 601.

‡ 1 Sam. 31: 1.

§ 1 Sam. 30: 1.

|| The seeming inconsistency of the Amalekite's narrative with 1 Sam. 31: 4—6, may be removed in two ways; either by supposing the Amalekite to have invented his story in the hope of obtaining favour with David; or by supposing that Saul did not immediately die after falling on his own sword, but rose up again. The latter would seem to be implied in the language ascribed to Saul in 2 Sam. 1: 9, and also from v. 10.

and wept, and fasted until even, for Saul and for Jonathan his son, and for the people of the Lord, and for the house of Israel; because they were fallen by the sword." In immediate connexion with this, the sacred historian proceeds to say: "And David lamented this lament over Saul and over Jonathan his son. Also he bade teach the children of Judah [this song of] THE Bow:* lo! it is written in the book of Jasher."†

From a review of all the circumstances, it is apparent, that although in bewailing the calamities of his country, the poet would naturally be led to introduce Saul as its prince and champion, yet his thoughts would instinctively turn to his tried and faithful friend and brother, the affectionate, the heroic Jonathan, the pride of his country, thus cut off with his brave companions by an untimely fate. We are now prepared to enter upon this pathetic Lamentation.

DAVID'S LAMENT.

2 SAM. 1: 19—27.

19 הַצְבִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־בְּמוֹתָיִךְ חָלַל
אֵיךְ נָפְלוּ גִבּוֹרִים:

20 אֶל־תִּגִּידוּ בְּנֵת
אֶל־תִּבְשְׁרוּ בְּחֻצֹת אֲשָׁקְלוֹן
פֶּן־תִּשְׁמַחְנָה בְּנוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים
פֶּן־תִּעְלֶזְנָה בְּנוֹת הָעַרְלִים:

21 הָרִי בְּגִלְפֶּעַ
אֶל־טַל וְאֶל־מָטָר עֲלֵיכֶם
וְשִׁדֵּי תְרוֹמוֹת

* See Calmet, art. *Bow*.

† See Bibl. Repos. III. p. 726. The miserable forgery under the name *Book of Jasher*, got up in England a century since and recently attempted to be revived, has been fully exposed by Mr Horne.

כִּי שָׁם נָגַעַל מִגֵּן גְּבוּרִים
מִגֵּן שָׂאוֹל בְּלִי מַשִּׁיחַ בַּשָּׁמֶן :

22 מִדָּם חָלָלִים מִחֶלֶב גְּבוּרִים
קָשַׁת יְהוֹנָתָן לֹא נִשְׁוּג אַחֲוֹר
וַחֲרֵב שָׂאוֹל לֹא תִשָּׁב רִיקָם :

23 שָׂאוֹל וַיהוֹנָתָן הַנְּאֻהָבִים וְהַנְּעִימִם בְּחַיֵּיהֶם
וּבְמוֹתָם לֹא נִפְרְדּוּ
מִנְּשָׁרִים קָלּוּ
מֵאֲרִיזֹת גָּבְרוּ :

24 בָּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־שָׂאוֹל בְּכִינָה
הַמִּלְבָּשָׁכֶם שָׁנִי עִם־עַדְנִים
הַמַּעֲלָה עָדִי זָהָב עַל לְבוֹשְׁכֶן :

25 אֵיךְ נָפְלוּ גְבוּרִים בְּחוּד הַמִּלְחָמָה
יְהוֹנָתָן עַל בְּמוֹתֶיךָ חָלָל :

26 צַר־לִי עָלֶיךָ אָחִי יְהוֹנָתָן
נַעֲמָה לִי מְאֹד
נִפְלְאַתָּה אֶהְבֶּתְךָ לִי
מֵאֲהַבַת נָשִׁים :

27 אֵיךְ נָפְלוּ גְבוּרִים
וַיֵּאָבְדּוּ כָלִי מִלְחָמָה :

TRANSLATION.

- 19 Beauty of Israel, slain upon thy mountains !
How are the mighty fallen !
- 20 Tell it not in Gath,
Publish it not in the streets of Askelon ;
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.
- 21 Mountains of Gilboa !
No dew, nor rain upon you,
Nor fields of offerings !
For there was cast away the shield of the mighty,
The shield of Saul not anointed with oil.
- 22 From the blood of the slain, from the flesh of the mighty,
The bow of Jonathan turned not back,
The sword of Saul returned not in vain.
- 23 Saul and Jonathan were loving and pleasant in their lives,
And in their death they were not divided,
They were swifter than eagles,
They were stronger than lions.
- 24 Daughters of Israel ! weep over Saul ;
Who clothed you in scarlet with delights,
Who put ornaments of gold upon your apparel.
- 25 How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle !
O Jonathan, slain upon thy mountains !
- 26 Wo is me for thee, my brother Jonathan !
Very pleasant hast thou been to me ;
Thy love to me was wonderful,
Passing the love of women !
- 27 How are the mighty fallen !
And the weapons of war perished !

NOTES.

The preceding arrangement of the poem shows that it is not less perfect in external symmetry, than in surpassing tenderness. It opens with an exclamation, addressed to the friend and brother fallen with his brave companions in battle upon their native mountains; and this is repeated as a refrain or burden with slight variations, v. 25, 27. Compare Ps. 42: 5, 11, 43: 5. The whole lament is full of similar prosopopœia and exclamation; see v. 20, 21, 24, 26.

VERSE 19. *Beauty of Israel*, i. e. Jonathan, the ornament and pride of the nation; comp. v. 25, where in the same refrain the name of Jonathan is substituted. Besides this requirement of poetical symmetry, it accords with nature that the first burst of grief should address itself directly to the beloved object. The form *הַצִּבִּי*, with the article, also indicates the vocative; Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 654. 4. Stuart § 412. d. The word *צִבִּי* properly signifies *beauty, ornament, glory, pride*; e. g. Is. 13: 19, Babylon is *צִבִּי מַמְלָכוֹת*, *the glory of kingdoms*. Ez. 20: 6, 15, the land of Israel is *צִבִּי לְכָל-הָאָרְצוֹת*, *the glory of all lands*. Dan. 11: 16, 41, *אֶרֶץ הַצִּבִּי*, *land of beauty*, is put for the land of Israel; and so *צִבִּי* alone, Dan. 8: 9.

But the word *צִבִּי*, like the Aramean *ܥܒܝ*, Arab. *ظبي*, signifies also a *gazelle*, one of the fleetest and most beautiful of the antelope tribe, and the frequent emblem of beauty and gracefulness among oriental poets. Thus Cant. 2: 9, "My beloved is like the gazelle;" comp. Prov. 5: 19. Hence some have here translated: *Gazelle of Israel, slain upon thy mountains!* The figure is exceedingly beautiful; and were the gratification of taste alone concerned, I would not scruple to adopt this rendering. But after long hesitation, it seems to me that the other line of the refrain, as also the variation in v. 25, requires here the more literal sense; especially as the gazelle is properly the emblem of delicacy and grace, not of manly strength and valour.

I have preferred the word 'mountains' to 'high places,' because the latter in the common usage of our version refers to idolatrous worship. For the use of *בָּמוֹת* to designate mountains, comp. Num. 21: 28, *בָּמוֹת אֲרִנּוֹךְ*, *mountains of Arnon*. Jer. 26: 18, *הָר הַבָּיִת לְבָמוֹת יַעַר*, *the mount of the temple [shall become] as forest mountains*. Mic. 3: 12. Ez. 36: 2, coll. v. 1.

The form **הִלֵּל** signifies properly *pierced*; hence it takes in general the sense of *wounded*, Job 24: 12. Ps. 69: 27. Jer. 51: 52; and also *slain*, Num. 19: 16. Deut. 21: 1, 2, 3, 6.

Having thus endeavoured to vindicate the correct poetical sense of this verse, it remains to observe, that interpreters in all ages have differed very much in the application of the words **הַצִּבִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל**. Their various opinions may be ranged under three classes, viz.

1. Those which adhere to the literal sense of **צִבִּי**, *beauty, glory*, etc. and mostly make it in the vocative. It is then variously applied, viz. (1.) To God; thus Junius and Tremellius: *O decus Israelis, in excelsis tuis confossi*, etc. (2.) To the heroes of Israel collectively, or perhaps to Saul and Jonathan in particular; so the Vulg. *Inclityi Israel, super montes tuos interfecti sunt*. But Luther takes it in the nominative: *Die Edelsten in Israel sind auf deiner Höhe erschlagen*. (3.) To the land of Israel; so the Engl. Bibles of 1589, 1599, etc. *O noble Israel, he [Saul] is slain upon thy high places*, etc. (4.) To mount Gilboa, by Prof. Stuart; see his Course of Heb. Study, p. 131.

2. Those which take **צִבִּי** in the sense of *gazelle*. The Syriac version first exhibits this interpretation, in the vocative form, but with nothing to shew whether it is addressed to Saul or Jonathan: *Gazelle of Israel, the slain are on thy mountains*. In this it is followed by the Arabic of the Polyglott. Among modern interpreters, Le Clerc seems to have been the first who adopted this sense; he translates thus: *O caprea Israelis*, etc. referring it to Saul. Michaelis, following in part the Syriac, has given to the whole an interrogative form, referring it to Jonathan: *Ist das Reh Israels auf deinen Höhen geschlagen?* This view seems at one time to have been adopted by Gesenius, who makes the **הַצִּבִּי** interrogative; Lehrgeb. p. 657. 2. b. Augusti and De Wette drop the interrogation: *Das Reh, O Israel, blühet auf deinen Höhen*. The translation which coincides nearest with the general view I have given above, is that of Dr Geddes in his version, Lond. 1792—7, viz. *O antelope of Israel, pierced on thine own mountains!* It may be proper to remark, that I was not aware of this partial coincidence until more than three years after my own views had become fixed.

3. By a very singular variation, the Seventy appear to have read **הַצִּבִּי** instead of **הַצִּבִּי**, and have translated thus: *Στήλωσον Ἀσραήλ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεθνηκότων ἐπὶ τὰ ὕψη σου τραυματιῶν*, i. e. *Erect, O Israel, a pillar for the slain*, etc. This is followed substantially by the Targum of Jonathan; and also by C. Thomson in his English version.

Whatever of beauty or propriety there may be in any of these

interpretations individually considered, the reasons above adduced, and especially the poetical symmetry and parallelism, seem to be decisive, that the appellation, "Beauty of Israel," can here appropriately and exclusively be applied only to Jonathan.

VERSE 20. This burst of patriotic feeling is best illustrated by the similar history of the Israelites after the death of Goliath and the defeat of the Philistines, 1 Sam 18: 6 sq. "The women came out of all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music. And the women answered as they played, and said :

"Saul hath slain his thousands,
And David his ten thousands."

VERSE 21. An imprecation against the mountains of Gilboa as the scene of carnage; not in the abrupt and vehement manner of the curse of Meroz in the Song of Deborah, Judg. 5: 23, but rather in a wild and plaintive strain of sad emotion. The plural is here used in allusion, probably, to the different peaks into which the range of Gilboa is divided, some of which rise to the height of one thousand feet above the Jordan.* For the construct form before א, see Gesen. Lebrg. p. 679. Stuart's Heb. Gram. § 432.

Fields of offerings imply fertile fields, producing the best and earliest fruits, such as one might bring in sacrifice to God.

The remainder of this verse seems to allude to that state of despondency and anguish of mind, in which Saul and the children of Israel entered into battle. No joyful anticipations, no forebodings of triumph were there; the Lord had forsaken them, and it had already been announced to Saul, that he and his sons should fall, and Israel be made captive. With what heart could even brave men fight under such circumstances? They could only yield to their fate; they rushed unprepared to the battle; they fought—but the 'shield of the mighty was cast away!'

The last line of the verse I have left ambiguous, precisely as it stands in the Hebrew. The epithet *not anointed with oil*, may refer either to the shield, or to Saul himself. If to the former, it presents another trait of Saul's despondency, that in his despair and anguish he neglected duly to prepare his armour and to anoint his shield before the battle. Compare Is. 21: 5, where the prophet, in announcing the sudden attack of Cyrus, makes the watchmen exclaim to the princes of Babylon, "Arise, *anoint the shield!*" as a preparation for instant fight. Jarchi says "Shields were made of tanned hides, and were anointed with oil in order to render them smooth;" as also to make them more compact and firm, and to prevent the breaking and decay of the leather. See Gesen. Comm. on

* Bibl. Repos. I. p. 599. Rosenm. Bibl. Geogr. II. i. p. 111.

Is. 21: 5. So the Sept. *θυστός Σαουλ οὐκ ἐχρίσθη ἐν ἔλαιῳ*. The only apparent objection to this interpretation lies in the use of the form *חָשִׁיךְ*, which is nowhere else applied to things, but always to persons, with the idea of consecration to some particular office or duty.

In this last manner have all the versions, except the Septuagint, understood *חָשִׁיךְ* in this passage as referring to Saul; and to complete the sense, have mostly supplied the particle of comparison *כִּי* before *חָשִׁיךְ*, viz. "The shield of Saul *as if* not anointed with oil;" i. e. as if he were not the Lord's anointed, as though he were a common man. This gives a sense entirely appropriate and poetical; and such an omission of *כִּי* is not unusual. Thus Ps. 11: 1, *Flee as a bird to your mountain*. Is. 51: 12, *man, who shall be made as grass*. Job 24: 5. Nah. 3: 12, 13. So the Vulgate, *quasi*; and so most modern versions. On the other hand, the Targum of Jonathan, the Syriac, and the Arabic, omit the negative, and render thus: "The shield of Saul, the anointed with oil;" i. e. the Lord's anointed.—Junius and Tremellius give a different turn to the idea, by taking *חָשִׁיךְ* not as a negative, but in the sense of *consumption, destruction*, as in Is. 38: 17; hence their version is: *per consumptionem ejus qui unctus erat deo*. Dr Geddes would read *חָשִׁיךְ* for *חָשִׁיךְ*, on mere conjecture, and translates: "The shield of Saul, the armour of the anointed," etc.

In this verse Saul is made prominent by the poet, as being king, and therefore the champion and representative of Israel.

VERSE 22. Saul and Jonathan as warriors. The word *חֵלֶב* signifies literally *fat*; but as connected in parallelism with *דָּם*, *blood*, it means *fleshy fibre, flesh*. A striking illustration of this whole poetical figure, as also of the use of the words *flesh* and *blood* in this connexion, is found in Deut. 32: 42, *אֶשְׂכִּיר חֵצֵי מַדָּם חָרָבִי, תֹאכְלִי בָשָׂר, I will make my arrows drunk with blood, my sword shall devour flesh*. Compare also Shakspeare in Henry IV, "Full bravely hast thou *flesh'd* thy maiden sword." David probably chose the word *חֵלֶב* in preference to *בָּשָׂר*, on account of its resemblance in sound to the form *חָרָב*, *sword*, in the corresponding parallel clause,—a reason which did not exist in the different construction of Moses' song. Compare also *מִשְׁכָּן*, Ps. 78: 31. Is. 10: 16.

VERSE 23. Saul and Jonathan as affectionate and amiable in their mutual private relations. Parent and child, they loved each other in life, and were also one in death. Their uncommon physical powers are also beautifully described.

VERSE 24. For the invocation of the *daughters of Israel* to

weep over Saul, compare the expression of our Lord, Luke 23: 28, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me," etc. Comp. also Judg. 11: 40. The idea implied is, that under Saul the land had attained to such a degree of wealth and prosperity, that elegance and splendour of dress were within the reach of all. *Scarlet* was the favourite colour of the wealthy and noble; see Prov. 31: 21. Lam. 4: 5. Dan. 5: 7, 16, 29. This appeal to the instinctive taste of the sex, well comports with the general character of oriental females; compare Judg. 5: 28 sq. Bibl. Repos. I. p. 608 sq.

The expression עִם צִדְּקִים, *with delights*, means probably as in the English version, 'with other delights,' i. e. he procured them other delicacies, enjoyments, etc. It may however be taken as in the place of an adjective, for *delightful, pleasing*, qualifying צִדְּקִי, *scarlet*; this however is less usual; comp. Gesen. Lehrs. p. 646. 4. Stuart's Heb. Gram. § 442.—The form רַחֲמֵינִי is Particip. Hiph. with Suff. of 2 plur. masc. applied to females; see the same usage in Ruth 1: 8, 9, 11, 13. Ex. 1: 21. Judg. 19: 24. al. Gesen. Lehrs. p. 731. 2. a. Stuart's Heb. Gram. § 476. b.

VERSE 25. See on v. 19, and the introduction. The initial verse of the poem is here repeated as a refrain, and the national part of the lament may be said to be closed.

VERSE 26. The poet now in a few touching words of exquisite pathos, gives utterance to his own private sorrow. The expressive צָרָה of the Hebrew cannot well be given in English. As most nearly corresponding to it I have chosen our plaintive old Saxon, *Wo is me for thee*, from the old English version in the editions of 1584—99, etc.

VERSE 27. The refrain is varied by the omission of the personal address, and the substitution of a different parallel clause.

ART. V.—LITERARY NOTICES.

By the Editor.

I. *The Zend Language and Zend-Avesta.* From Prof. Kosegarten.

In our second Number, Vol. I. p. 407, is a notice respecting the Zend-Avesta, its antiquity and authority, and the general merits of the translation by Anquetil du Perron; as also respecting the proposed publication of the original by Prof. J. Olshausen of Kiel, in which we regret to learn that no progress has been made beyond the *Fasciculus* there announced. In the mean time, however, the same labour has been undertaken in France, by the distinguished oriental scholar Eugene Burnouf, who is proceeding with more rapidity in giving to the public a *litho-autographic* copy of the Parisian manuscript, under the title: *Vendidad Sade, l'un des livres de Zoroastre. Publié d'après le manuscrit Zend de la bibliothèque du Roi. Texte Zend.* Livraison 1—8. Paris 1830—33. fol. pp. 448. The following remarks upon the publications of Burnouf and Olshausen, are from the pen of Prof. Kosegarten, one of the most learned and judicious of oriental scholars; and their value is enhanced not only by the critical estimate given of Anquetil's version, but also by the information afforded as to the nature and character of the Zend language, and the sources from which an acquaintance with it is to be derived. The remarks are extracted from an article in the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* for June 1833, Nos. 96, 97.

“In the zeal with which the study of oriental philology is at present pursued, it was to be expected, that new attention and a thorough investigation would soon be applied to the ancient religious books of the Persians; which were first introduced to us by Anquetil du Perron, and which we call Zend-Avesta. That Anquetil's translation of these books was in many places paraphrastic, uncertain, and unsatisfactory, was indeed very obvious from the notes which he inserted by way of philological illustration in the margin of his work. In these the uncertainty of his exposition is constantly conspicuous, so soon as he makes any attempt at etymological explanation, as also when he often

says, *Ces paroles peuvent se rendre encore de cette manière, or Ou pourroit encore traduire ainsi.* Anquetil never gives any explanation in respect to the grammatical character of the Zend in its details; nor has he left behind any lexicographical attempts in regard to that language. The meagre vocabularies printed in his work were not composed by him, but merely copied in India; and they are so imperfect, that neither the grammatical endings nor other forms are properly distinguished. We find in them everywhere such specifications as the following would be in a Latin vocabulary, viz. *hominum*, man; *tibi*, thou; *nostrum*, I; *purusque*, pure; *venisti*, to come. These vocabularies were probably taken from some kind of interlinear version of the Zend text; they are properly *glosses*. Anquetil undoubtedly made his translation chiefly in accordance with an oral interpretation, which the Parsees at Surat repeated to him. He appears never to have attained to any real acquaintance with the grammatical forms of the Zend language; since he has so frequently in his version utterly neglected them. This careless mode of pursuing the study of philology deserves in him indeed a milder censure; because in his time the exact and critical mode of studying languages demanded nowadays, was wholly unknown, and all the more important helps and preparatory labours were still entirely wanting.

"The first requisite in order to render the study of the Zend text possible, naturally was to make this text accessible to the public by the aid of printing or lithography; since it can be in the power of very few scholars to make use of the manuscripts existing at Paris, Copenhagen, and Oxford. This task of multiplying copies of the text, the editors of the two works above-mentioned have undertaken; both of them with the help of lithography, although the preparation of Zend types for printing cannot be attended with any great difficulty or expense, and has in fact already been accomplished in Berlin.* Indeed, the Zend alphabet contains by no means so great a number of letters and signs, as for instance the Arabic or the Devanagari for the Sanscrit.

"M. Burnouf has advanced the farthest in his lithographic labours. He gives a *fac simile* of the Paris manuscript, which contains the *Vendidad Sade* in the order preferred by the present Parsees,

* These types are found in Bopp's *Vergleichende Grammatik der Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen*, etc. Berlin 1833.

viz. so that the three books *Izeshne*, *Vispered*, and *Vendidad* are section-wise mingled together. The *Izeshne* we know is divided into sections called *Hâs*, the *Vispered* into *Kardes*, and the *Vendidad* into *Fargards*. These *Hâs*, *Kardes* and *Fargards* stand in the Paris manuscript all mixed up together. The editor announces, that he intends also to give hereafter a new translation of the *Vendidad Sade*, with a commentary. In this he will be able to avail himself with great advantage of a Sanscrit version of the *Izeshne* at Paris, which appears to be very literal, and has been described by him in the 'Journal Asiatique.' This Sanscrit version was made by a Parsee named Nerioseng, about three centuries ago; and M. Burnouf has already announced his intention of publishing it. In his edition of the Zend text, M. Burnouf gives only the text of a single manuscript, without meddling at all with various readings.

"Prof. Olshausen gives in his edition, which also is lithographic, only the book *Vendidad*, exclusive of the *Izeshne* and the *Vispered*. We have here consequently the text of the *Vendidad* continuously, and divided only into its *Fargards*, as we find it in Anquetil's French version. In the margin the editor has subjoined various readings derived from another Paris manuscript; it is matter of surprise, that he has not also made use of the Copenhagen manuscripts. The selection of a text among these various readings, must of course, in our present imperfect acquaintance with the Zend language, be very much a matter of hazard; still, the addition of these readings is at all events to be commended. The letters and strokes in Olshausen's edition are smaller and more distinct than in that of Burnouf. The first part or *fasciculus* of the former, which appeared in 1829, extends only to the fourth *Fargard* of the *Vendidad*, which contains in all twenty-two *Fargards*. Since that time nothing further of this edition has appeared, so far as I know; nor do I know whether it will be continued. The editor promised also an *Apparatus criticus et lexicalis*.

"The sources from which we may derive aid in investigating the Zend language are at present the following: Anquetil's translation of the Zend-Avesta; the Zend and Pehlvi vocabularies communicated by him, and many others of the same kind which lie in manuscript at London and Copenhagen; the Sanscrit translation of the *Izeshne* by Nerioseng; the Pehlvi copies of the Zend books; and finally the comparison of the Zend with the Sanscrit, which has been recently applied, particularly by

Bopp, with great success. The Zend indeed, in its roots and in its grammatical forms, is a near sister of the Sanscrit; and hence also its affinity with the Greek, Latin, and Gothic, is a natural consequence.

“Works which have recently appeared and which afford aid for the illustration of the Zend text, are the following. Rask in his treatise: *Ueber das Alter und die Aechtheit der Zend-sprache*, Berlin 1826, has given the pronunciation and power of the Zend letters more exactly and correctly, than had been done by Anquetil. Bohlen in his essay: *De origine linguae Zendicae*, Königsb. 1831, has instituted many comparisons of Zend words and grammatical forms with those of the Sanscrit and modern Persian; but has built too much upon Zend words which are often incorrectly explained in Anquetil’s vocabularies. Burnouf, in the ‘*Journal Asiatique*,’ 1829, has explained several passages of the Zend text with the help of the Sanscrit version of Nerioseng, and has added some general remarks on several grammatical peculiarities of the Zend; he has also done the like in a review of Bohlen’s essay in the ‘*Journal des Savans*’ for Aug. 1832. Bopp, however, has in this respect accomplished more than all others, in several articles in the ‘*Berliner Jahrbücher*,’ and in the later portions of his *Grammatica critica linguae Sanscritae*. He has pointed out the relation of many Zend forms to the corresponding Sanscrit forms, and has accurately explained many single passages of the Zend text; thus correcting the translation of Anquetil. He also has first pointed out the mythological affinity between the Zend doctrines and those of India; e. g. with reference to the Indian beings *Fama*, *Aswinas*, *Writrahan*, which re-appear in the Zend-Avesta; to which mythological affinities Burnouf has also quite recently added some others, e. g. with reference to *Gershasp* i. q. *Krishaswa*, *Elborsh* i. q. *Wrihat*, and others. The *Vergleichende Grammatik* of Bopp, however, [mentioned in the preceding note,] affords still more complete exhibitions of the Zend forms; and properly so, since the Zend now constitutes an important member in the Indo-European family of languages.

“By the use of the helps already extant for the study of the Zend text, we are able in many parts to understand the text perfectly, and to give an exact and sufficiently certain account of the grammatical form of each single word. But we often find ourselves brought to a stand, especially by roots and words peculiar to the Zend, which are not contained in the kindred

languages, and the signification of which cannot with certainty be assumed from the connexion nor from Anquetil's translation. The Zend, in its grammatical forms, is occasionally more complete and antique than the Sanscrit, and agrees sometimes with the more ancient Veda-Sanscrit; sometimes however the Zend terminations are already much abraded, and many case-endings have thus come to have the same sound. The same relation in respect to forms still entire, is found in many ancient kindred languages; one language or dialect has retained the antique shape in one form; another dialect has it no longer in this same form, but in another; while neither has, more than the other, the stamp of antiquity throughout. The Zend words seem to be tolerably rich in vowels; inasmuch as the Zend loves to insert, first, a short *a* before another vowel; and, secondly, a short *i* in a syllable, when the following syllable ends with *i* or *e*. E. g.

Sanscrit.	Zend.	
<i>giri</i> . . .	<i>gairi</i> . . .	mountain.
<i>sreshta</i> . . .	<i>sraesta</i> . . .	better.
<i>été</i> . . .	<i>aété</i> . . .	these, <i>hi</i> .
<i>étéshâm</i> . . .	<i>aétaéshâm</i> . . .	of these, <i>horum</i> .
<i>api</i> . . .	<i>aipi</i> . . .	also.
<i>bharati</i> . . .	<i>baraiti</i> . . .	he bears, <i>fert</i> ."

The remainder of Prof. Kosegarten's article is occupied with critical discussions upon quite a number of passages of the Zend-Avesta, and the consequent correction of Anquetil's version. These discussions may very properly be subjoined to the list of helps above given by himself.

II. *German Philosophy.* From the German of Prof. F. E. Beneke, of Berlin.

The following remarks will perhaps be interesting to some of our readers, as presenting the German philosophy in contrast with the prevailing systems in England and America, and thus exhibiting in a more tangible form some of the peculiar characteristics of the former. We translate them from a review of Prof. Upham's work: *Elements of Mental Philosophy*, contained in the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* of Halle for July 1833, Erg. Bl. Nos. 66, 67. The article is by Prof. Beneke, himself a very respectable writer on philosophy; and while he does justice to the merits of the work in point of ability, he takes occasion, in remarking upon it, to state occasionally the doctrines of Ger-

man philosophers on the various topics in question. We give here the introduction and conclusion of the article ; the remainder is chiefly an analytical statement of the contents of the work reviewed.

“In the mode of treating philosophy also, every nation develops a peculiar character, precisely corresponding to that which is manifested by it in the other departments of life. Among the English there predominates a cautious collection and analysis of the results of experience, not exactly deep and discriminating, but exercised with great good sense and to a comprehensive extent, and applied more particularly to the feelings and other *immediate* forms of conviction. On the other hand, we find prominent among the French only *single* ideas, partly borrowed from others, and partly first presented in the form of hasty suggestions, but arranged together with piquancy and clothed in a splendid rhetoric. The Italians in recent times seem to have made it their chief employment, to sift with acuteness what has been advanced by other nations, and thus prepare it for an appropriate general survey. We Germans, finally, are, on the one hand, also here the *learned*—more comprehensive than other nations, although of late somewhat restricted in consequence of an overweening self-estimation—while on the other hand, there certainly lies in our philosophical efforts a more perfect *norm* or rule both of proof (*Begründung*) and of deduction (*Ableitung*), than in those of any other nation. Hitherto, indeed, we have not arrived at any proper materials, any sure foundation, for the application of this *norm* ; but have for the most part only built up castles of shade and mist in the air.

“In like manner the North Americans, after having once begun to occupy themselves in earnest with philosophy, have impressed upon this occupation likewise their own peculiar national character. Being themselves in general only a branch of an European people, their philosophy also has as yet presented nothing in any way original. Not only, indeed, do they with great diligence appropriate to themselves whatever of philosophical knowledge is any where brought to light, and especially in their mother country ; and exhibit, in the selection of that which they thus appropriate, the same strong good sense which is apparent in their political institutions ; but we also see them applying what they have thus gained, so immediately and to such an extent to *practical* life, that it is very evident, they have sought this knowledge from the very first only with a view to this ap-

plication. An article in the *North American Review*,* which we saw not long since, attempts in the introduction to excite a taste for a more zealous and persevering study of philosophy, than has hitherto prevailed in the United States. A German would at once have broken out into dithyrambs on the divine sublimity of this science, and have hurried the reader away into its celestial regions. But how is it with the American? We see him examining through several pages, how the principle of the association of ideas is, and may be made, just as powerful in controlling the intellectual and moral world, as the principle of the power of steam for operating upon the material world. 'Supposing,' he says, 'all that has been written and said about the principle of the association of ideas had been suppressed, can it be conceived, that every individual in the world at this moment would have been equally wise and skilful, equally happy and virtuous?—Of two orators, in other respects equal, which should we most confidently select for the management of a cause, one who has been taught the doctrine of association and all its known relations and effects, or one who only instinctively and unconsciously acts upon it? To us there seems a vast accession of power and resources placed at the disposal of the former.—When gloomy thoughts overshadow and oppress the soul, the well educated man, who happily has not neglected the science of the mind, recollects what he has been taught in books, and in the lecture room, concerning continued trains of ideas, and the power of the associating principle. He therefore seizes the assistance of this intellectual instrument to lead his attention towards brighter objects of contemplation, and thus to dissipate his gloom. And this he does with much more avidity and effect, than the untutored son of sorrow, who, unacquainted with the whole nature and extent of the blessed power within him, makes perhaps, or perhaps not, a few faint efforts, which instinct may benevolently prompt, to turn the train of his ideas and feelings, but soon again desperately yields up his soul to its fixed and haunting agony.' So too the influence of this principle in all literary labours is described as vast; and the reviewer goes on to suggest how much is still to be done in the way of experiment, in respect not only to this, but to a hundred other similar relations.

"The same fundamental character we find in the work be-

* Vol. XLIX. No. 45. p. 4 sq.

fore us. Written for students, it lays no claim to originality; the author professes only to give a condensed and impartial survey of that which is received as clearly and certainly known by the most distinguished philosophical thinkers of all nations.

* * *

“In general,—and this was for the writer the most interesting point in the book,—it is hardly possible to conceive of a more thorough-going contrast, than exists between the mode of treating philosophy here exhibited, and that which prevails among us Germans. While in Germany, generally speaking, in philosophy, the proof (*Begründung*) from experience, as belonging to a certain common ground, is put under a sort of ban; we find the author of this work referring every thing back to experience, not only in general, but with a very decided preference to *external* experience.—If, further, an analytical *division* (*Einteilung*) is to be introduced, or the analytical *exhibition of a complex whole* (*Darlegung eines Mannichfaltigen*), we Germans take it for granted from the very outset, even before half the materials, or subject to be thus divided or exhibited, are in our possession, that the division or exhibition will be *absolutely exhausting*, and *eternally immutable*,—an eternity, it is true, which not seldom finds its end with the next Leipsic fair. On the other hand, the American author, inclining too far on the opposite extreme, never makes completeness and the final settling of a question even so much as his aim; but every where contents himself with saying, he will by no means maintain that this or that may not be added to his enumeration, or that a more appropriate arrangement may not be given to it.

* * *

“In all this, it has anew occurred to the writer, how great an unanimity is manifested in the developements of the modern and most recent philosophy among all nations; however much they may appear to the superficial observer to stand in entire contradiction with each other. The view which, through a species of misapprehension, was found in Locke’s *Essay on the Human Understanding*, that all human knowledge comes *from without*, was pressed to its extreme point by Condillac, Hume, and some others. Hence arose a reaction, in Scotland through Reid, in Germany through Kant; in so far as it was maintained, that for the production of all knowledge *certain primitive elements*, originating from our own minds, must be superadded as equally es-

sential. Now that, according to Kant, these mental or spiritual elements *consist* mostly in conceptions (Begriffe); or according to the doctrines of the Scottish school have all of them a more *special* and *immediate* form; is surely only a subordinate difference, in respect to which both parties may perhaps be about equally right and equally wrong. The fact that Kant undertakes to exhibit these principles of our knowledge in a complete scheme, according to a peculiar principle of deduction, while the Scottish school only places them together at random, testifies certainly to a more systematic spirit in the former; although in respect to the results, this is of no great importance, so long as the truth of the whole mode of exhibition must still be considered as problematical. In short, the essential view at bottom is on both sides precisely the same; whether we call the 'original suggestion,' in which both agree, by the names of *reine Anschauung* and *Kategorien* (pure intuition and categories), or *constitution of mind*, *judgments of nature*, *relative suggestions*, etc. But against this reaction, a new and highly important further reaction has taken place. The question, namely, arises, whether these primitive elements, thus superadded from the human mind for the production of knowledge, are really *originally* given in the mind as a something *already complete*; or whether they are not perhaps, at least the greater part of them, *first formed* in the developement of the human soul; so that consequently the imparting of them may be not *original*, but have taken place *later*. This is the great problem, with which we now see the philosophical investigations of every country occupied. Along with this effort, moreover, to prove what has been held as *original* to be something *first developed*, inquiries have not stopped short at these forms of pure intuition, categories, relative suggestions, etc. but every thing which has been adduced as in any way or form *born in or with* the human soul, has been subjected to this examination. This is especially true of the so called *abstract powers* or *faculties*, which have been introduced into the science from the popular view of physical developement. Thus we see them attacked in Italy by Romagnosi; in England, Dr Brown in his Lectures, as also in his Sketch of the Philosophy of the Human Mind, has shown that several of these reputed *original* powers are to be referred to the joint operation of others; the author of the work before us also in several places declares himself not indisposed to such a derivation; while among us in Germany war has been declared by Herbart against

all abstract faculties, as also, in a different way, by the writer. Yea, even our German *speculative* systems have obviously the same tendency; inasmuch as they no longer admit, in order for the production of knowledge, a mere flowing together of a dead existing form with the objective elements, but only a living plastic motion. Their chief error is, that they have carried out that in a fantastic imaginative manner, which, if carried out by means of a cautious analysis of the results of experience, will form the immutable basis of future psychology, and cast a light as yet unthought of, upon every department of life.

"Thus, then, that perplexing contradiction of philosophical developments, which seems to shut out from the future every prospect of unanimity, exists only so long as we are unable to penetrate the external shell and arrive at the kernel; while in this kernel we perceive such an unanimity in fact already so far prepared, that we may hope the time is not far distant, when it will shoot forth into light, and then rapidly spring up and bring forth rich blossoms and precious fruit."

III. *Additional Notices on Slavic Literature.*

The reviewer of Schaffarik's *Geschichte der Slavischen Literatur* in the Vienna *Jahrbücher*, Vol. XXXVII, 1827, evidently a profound Slavic scholar, rejects several of the opinions adopted in that work, and calls in question many others, some of which have been followed by the writer of the preceding sketch of the History of Slavic Literature. According to his view,—and in this he is not alone,—the dialect of the Bulgarians,* the Slavic 'Lingua Romana,' ought to have been treated as a separate language, distinct from the Servian branch,—with more right, indeed, than the Slovakish can be separated from the Bohemian. But the amount of certain information which we yet possess respecting this dialect, is so small, that even an error concerning it would be very excusable.—The same reviewer states, that the ancient manuscript in prose, mentioned on p. 427, has since been proved to be spurious. He also declares the signification assigned to the appellative 'Lekh, Lekhes,' on p. 472, to be a mistake, without however giving the true etymology and meaning in its place.

In addition to what is said in respect to the early Polish lit-

* Page 394, 400, above.

erature, p. 480, it may be added, that in 1828 a manuscript of A. D. 1453 was published under the title; *Pamiętniki Janczara*, etc. i. e. 'Journal of a Polish Nobleman,' who was induced by circumstances to enter the Turkish army during the siege and conquest of Constantinople. This work, besides containing some important historical information, is of still greater interest in respect to the Polish language, of which there exist so few ancient monuments; and which has altered so much, that it was found requisite to add a version in modern Polish, in order to render the work intelligible.

At the close of the History of Polish literature, it ought to have been mentioned, that in consequence of the late insurrection, the universities of Wilna and Warsaw have been suppressed, and in their stead a new one established at Kief; that, in order to deprive the Polish youth of all means for an independent national education, the great public library of Warsaw, as formerly that of Zaluski, has been removed to St. Petersburg; and, finally, that all the institutions for public education at the expense of the crown, have been removed to Russia.

THE
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

No. XVI

OCTOBER, 1834.

ART. I. ON THE CATECHETICAL SCHOÓL, OR THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, AT ALEXANDRIA IN EGYPT.

By R. EMERSON, Prof. of Ecclesiastical History, in the Theo. Sem. Andover.

[PART SECOND CONTINUED.]

On the Doctrines taught in the Alexandrian School.

VI. ANTHROPOLOGY.

This term has been more frequently applied in respect to man's physical than his moral nature. The latter use, however, appears well established in Europe. The term seems as much needed in the science of morals as of physiology, if we would avoid the tedious, and often inaccurate or ambiguous, circumlocutions that have been employed in its place. I am therefore led to introduce it here, notwithstanding a deep dislike to uncommon terms. If such a technical word shall be found at all to aid us in the moral SCIENCE OF MAN, its office will be good.

On this subject the sentiments of some of these Alexandrian fathers have already been, in part, anticipated, while treating on other topics, in a previous part of this essay.

Athenagoras. According to this teacher, men become "virtuous or vicious, by their own free choice." Their nature, in itself, is good; and sin arises from free will, corrupted by evil spirits. "Although the same power of reason is common to all, yet they are severally borne away, in diverse directions, as each

Vol. IV. No. 16.

79

one is partly inclined by his own disposition, and partly influenced by those evil *genii*, the prince of matter and his coadjutors.— And this happens to the soul, when it receives into itself the animal spirit, and is mingled with it in a kind of union, not looking upward to celestial things and their Maker, but wholly downward to the terrestrial, and to the earth, as though it were entirely flesh and blood, and no longer a pure spirit.”¹ Such declarations are, of course, made on the old assumption of the three fold nature of man, as consisting of *spirit, soul, and body*. This father, however, by no means supposed sin to proceed from the *body only*; nor, on the other hand, that the *mind alone* exercises virtue; but that both proceed from both, or from the whole man.²

Clement. This father is more explicit on the threefold nature of man, as held to by the Platonists; and according to which, he interpreted the language of Scripture in many places. In addition to the body, there is according to this writer the rational soul, or mind, *λογικὴ ψυχὴ, νοῦς*; and the fleshly, bodily, and irrational soul or spirit, *σωματικὴ ψυχὴ, πνεῦμα ἄλογον, σαρκικόν*. The *bodily soul*, or life, is made by God; the mind, the image of the *λόγος*, is breathed into man by God. “Yet, the soul is acknowledged to be the better part of man, and the body the poorer. But neither is the soul morally good by nature, nor the body morally bad by nature. Neither, indeed, is that forthwith evil, which is not good; for there are certain things which hold a middle place, both such as are *naturally* good and such as are *naturally* bad, *καὶ προηγμένα καὶ ἀποπροηγμένα*.”³

On *freedom of will*, he thus writes, immediately after speaking of a godly life: “Now, any thing is in our power, when we are equally the masters of that and of its opposite; as, to philosophize, or not; and to believe, or to disbelieve. And what is in our power, is found possible by our being equally masters of each of the opposite things.”⁴ And in another place, he contends, that “neither praises, nor censures, nor honours, nor punishments are just, if the soul has not the power of embracing or shunning; but the evil is involuntary. “Hence,” as he goes on to argue, “whoever hinders any one from doing a thing, is responsible for such hindrance; but he who does not thus in-

¹ Athen. Apol. c. 22, 23.

² See Guer. II. p. 104.

³ Strom. IV. 26.

⁴ Strom. IV. 24.

terpose, may justly sit in judgment on the choice of the soul ; so that God is not the responsible cause of our sin. But since free choice and voluntary seeking, are the commencement of sin, and a false notion sometimes prevails, which we through ignorance neglect to abandon, punishments are therefore justly inflicted. For to be sick of a fever is involuntary, but when one brings a fever on himself, by his intemperance, we blame him. Thus the *evil* may be involuntary, as no one chooses evil, simply *as evil* ; but drawn away by the pleasure that surrounds it, supposing it good, he decides to embrace it. These things being so, it is in our power to be free from ignorance and from an evil though pleasing choice, and in spite of them, to refuse our assent to these seductive illusions.”¹

Passages like the above, are frequent in the ancient fathers ; and they amply prove, that these fathers held to a genuine free will, in distinction from fate and from all constraint that would interfere with such freedom. But, when detached portions of these passages are brought, as they sometimes are, to prove that the fathers, who lived before Augustine, held to such a freedom of the will as to exclude the purposes, if not also the agency of God, in respect to man’s conduct, there is a sad mistake. Take, for instance, the passage last quoted ; and we find, that instead of human freedom’s being asserted in opposition to God’s foreknowledge and purposes respecting sin, it is here asserted and explained for the very purpose of vindicating the divine character against the charge, then frequently brought, and ever since brought, against God, for not preventing sin, when he had it in his power to prevent it. Clement had just spoken of one kind of sin, “the use which heathen philosophy had made of divine truth, and which God foresaw and did not prevent, and that because he had a good purpose for which he designed to overrule the sin, though the perpetrator had a different and bad purpose.” At this stage of his argument, he says, “I know there are multitudes continually rising up against us and saying, that he who does not prevent, is himself a responsible cause.” After dwelling on this position, and showing its absurdity in some respects, he thus continues : “But if we must scrutinize the matter closely, in opposition to these men, let them know, that, in what we speak of as taking place in theft, *non-prevention*, τὸ μὴ ἀπολύειν, is not at all a cause ; but *prevention*, (or that which is

¹ Strom. I. 17.

preventive,) τὸ καλυπτικόν, is liable to the responsibility of causation. For he who shields one, is the cause of his not being wounded, preventing him from being wounded. And the demon was a *cause* to Socrates, not in not preventing him, but in *persuading*, although he did not actually persuade him." Then follows the quotation given above, and which this view of its connexion may help us the better to understand, in other points beside the one for which I have more especially introduced it. While Clement holds to the perfect knowledge and power of God in governing free agents, in the fullest sense which any would claim, he, at the same time, takes very good care, that his statements may not seem inconsistent with the freedom of moral agents.

In connexion with these doctrines, Clement held to the exercise of faith in the work of acceptable obedience. He supposed faith, which he would denominate "a kind of natural art," to cooperate with pious instruction, and goes on to illustrate his views in the following manner. "Thus a prolific soil aids the germination of seeds; for the best instruction is useless, without the reception of the learner; and so is prophesying, without the obedience of the hearers. For dry straw, prepared to receive the power of fire, is easily kindled; and the celebrated stone [load-stone] attracts iron by its kindred nature; as also the tear of amber attracts straw, and amber draws up heaps of chaff. But the things thus attracted, obey those bodies, being drawn by an inexplicable breath (or spirit), πνεῦμα, not as the sole causes, but as the joint-causes. Now, the form of evil being two-fold, the one, that of deception and concealment, and the other, that of open and overpowering assault, the divine Word cries aloud, calling all collectively. And while he knew, most perfectly, those who would not obey, yet, because it is in our power to obey or not, that none might have ignorance to plead, he made a just call, and demands what is in the power of each one; for some have the power both to will and to do, having grown to this by careful practice, and are purified; but others though they are not yet able, have the power to will. The work of willing, belongs to the soul; but that of doing, is not without the body."¹ And a little before the passage just quoted, he says: "No longer, then, is faith a duty discharged by free choice, provided it is the prerogative of nature, [i. e. by physical necessity.] Nor does he receive a just

¹ Strom. II. 6.

recompense, who does not believe, since it is not his fault ; nor he who believes, since he is not the cause. Nor, if we rightly view the subject, could there be any peculiarity or difference between faith and unbelief, arising from either praise or blame, provided a physical necessity, from the Supreme Ruler, be the leading cause. But if we, like inanimate things, are moved with cords, by physical energies, both willingness and unwillingness are superfluous ; and so, likewise, is tendency, *ὁρμή*, which precedes these. Nor do I yet understand the nature of that living being, whose bias, *τὸ ὁρητικόν*, necessity has allotted to be moved by a cause from without." Clement goes on to argue that there can be no room for repentance on this ground ; and then proceeds for substance, in the following manner : " So neither is baptism any longer reasonable ; nor the blessed seal ; nor the Son ; nor the Father. But God is found to be merely the arbitrary author of the certain natures ; which leaves no foundation for gospel salvation, viz. a voluntary faith. But we have learned from the Scriptures, that the power of choosing and refusing, arising from free will, *αὐτοκρατορικὴ*, is given by the Lord to men ; and therefore we repose with an immoveable decision, in the scheme of faith, exhibiting a prompt and zealous spirit, because we have chosen life, and believed in God through his voice. And whoever believes the Word, knows the thing true ; for the Word is truth."¹

As to the *pre-existence of the soul*, Clement probably believed in the doctrine, at least so far as to hold that the soul is sent from heaven and infused into the body, which then becomes conscious. But he refutes the notion, that the soul is itself God, or a part of God.²

On the *creation and fall of Adam*, etc. he thus writes. " In addition to all, they ought to know this, that we are born with an adaptation, by nature, to virtue ; not, indeed, so that we have it from the commencement of existence, but we are fitted to acquire it. On this principle, is solved the doubt, started for us by the heretics, Whether Adam was formed perfect, *τέλειος*, or imperfect ? And, if imperfect, how is the work of a perfect God *imperfect* ? and, above all, *man* ? But, if perfect, how does he transgress the commandments ? They shall then hear from us, that he was not made perfect, at his formation, but was adapted to the acquisition of virtue. But it contributes much to virtue, that he was made with an adaptation to its attainment. The

¹ Strom. II. 3, 4.

² See Guer. II. p. 141.

design is, that we should be saved of our own selves. This, therefore is, the nature of the soul, that it should move of itself. Being then rational, and as philosophy pertains to reason, we possess something akin to it. And adaptedness is, indeed, a *bearing*, *φορά*, towards virtue, but not *virtue* itself. All, therefore, as I said, are naturally formed for the acquisition of virtue; but one applies himself more, and another less, to knowledge and practice. Hence some attain to perfect virtue; and others arrive at a degree of it; while some, again, although otherwise of good qualities, *εὐποιεῖς*, turn away in the contrary direction.¹

Again, speculating on the formation of the body of man, he says: "Man, simply considered, is formed according to the idea of the spirit with which the body is united; for it is not produced without form and shapeless, in the workshop of nature, where the generation of man is mysteriously perfected, art and essence being both common. And each man is characterized by the mark imprinted on his soul by the things which he shall choose. According to this, we say, that Adam was perfect, as to his formation; for nothing was wanting to him of those things which characterize the idea and form of man. But he, in coming into being, received perfection,—became completely a man, endowed with free will. That he should then choose, and much more, that he should choose what was forbidden, is not the fault of God, but of him who thus chose."²

It would seem, from the above, that Clement considered the moral state of infants, and the original state of Adam before he began to act, as essentially the same, 'being endowed indeed with an adaptation to virtue, but not virtuous in fact.'—But let us proceed with his views of the fall.

Considering free will, as man's noblest prerogative, he says; "This nobleness is shown in choosing and practising the best things. But wherein did such nobleness of his, benefit Adam? and that, as his father was no mortal? for himself was the father of men who exist from generation. Following his wife, he eagerly chose base things, and neglected what are true and comely; by which he exchanged an immortal for a mortal life; but not forever."³ And elsewhere, he says: "the malignant serpent formerly drew Eve,—and now draws others into death."⁴ "The first man, once inhabiting Paradise, sported freely, as the

¹ Strom. VI. 11, 12.

² Strom. IV. 23.

³ Strom. II. 19.

⁴ Cohor. 1.

little child of God. But after he had subjected himself to voluptuousness, (for the serpent suggested such pleasure, as he crept upon his belly, an earthly vice,) seduced by depraved lusts the child grew up in disobedience. And disobeying his father, he dishonoured God. How powerful was pleasure! Man, loosed through simplicity, was found bound to sins. The Lord, desiring to loose him from these bonds again, assumed flesh," etc.¹

The following is his account of the first sin of Adam and Eve, taking it for granted, that the Scripture account is allegorical. "But although it was nature [not the serpent] that led them, as also irrational animals, πρὸς παιδοποιΐαν, ἐκινήθησαν δὲ θάττον ἢ προσήκον ἦν εἰς νέου πεφυκότες, being induced by the deceit [of the serpent]. The judgment of God was, therefore, just on them, as they would not await his will."²

On *original sin*, it is not perhaps easy to say what were his views. It is plain, from what has already been quoted, and from much more which might be adduced, that he could not consistently hold to the doctrine, in the sense in which it has been embraced by multitudes, especially since the days of Augustine. I know, indeed, of no passage in his writings, which shows that he considered a *capacity* or a *propensity* to sin, as being itself positively sinful; as he certainly did not consider an 'adaptedness to virtue, as being itself virtue,' as we have already seen. Yet he held clearly to the opinion, that all men sin; and that this is by nature, and even by something innate, as appears by the following incidental remark, which I will give in its connexion. "But he, [God,] joyfully accepts the penitence of the sinner, delighting in penitence which follows transgressions. For the Word alone is sinless. For, to sin, is innate and common to all,—τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἑξαμαρτάνειν, πᾶσιν ἔμφυτον καὶ κοινόν. But to return, after sin, does not pertain to every man, but to him that is truly excellent."³

The following passage is about equally difficult and curious, and may possibly cast some light on his views. Arguing against those who considered generation itself to be sin, he thus proceeds. "*No one is free from pollution, says Job, not even though his life be but one day.* Let them tell us, Whence was this newborn infant guilty of fornication? or how has he fallen under the curse of Adam, who has done nothing? It consequent-

¹ Cohor.. 11. p. 174.

² Strom. III. 17

³ Paed. III. 12.

ly remains for them, as it seems, to say, that generation is evil, and not only the generation of the body, but also that of the soul; for the body is formed by the soul. And when David says, *I was conceived in sins, and in iniquities did my mother long, in my gestation*, he speaks as a prophet concerning mother Eve. But Eve was the mother of *those living*; and if he was *conceived in sins*, yet he was not himself *in sin*, nor was he himself *sin*. But whether each one who turns from sin to faith, turns to life from the custom of habitual sin, as from a mother, one of the twelve prophets shall bear me testimony, who says, *If I give my first born for my impiety, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul*. He does not blame him who said, *Be fruitful and multiply*; but the very first motions, *ôqual*, after generation, in which motions we know not God, he pronounces to be impieties."¹

It is not very easy to see, precisely, what this writer understood by some of the Scripture passages he thus quoted; but we see very clearly what he did *not* understand by them. While he held to no sin *previous to free agency*, it is not very unnatural for him to speak of sin *before birth*, as he supposed the soul to exist before the body, and to have, as it would seem, an intelligent agency in the formation of the body.

Besides the influence of evil spirits, he believed in two sources of sin. "Although men do myriads of things, yet there are but just two causes, *αρχαι*, of each sin, ignorance and weakness; but each of these is in our power, since we are neither willing to learn, nor to restrain lust. By one of these, we judge incorrectly; by the other, we are incompetent to the execution of right decisions.—Consequently, two kinds of discipline are delivered, adapted to each of the evils; for the one, knowledge and the clear exhibition of the testimony of the Scriptures; for the other, a system of practice, *ἀσκησις*, according to the Word, guided by faith and fear."²

But while error in the mind thus effected the heart and life, Clement believed no less in the power of the heart to guide the belief; as will appear from a passage which will, at the same time, teach us something else.

"But, as it appears, every heresy has, as its origin, not ears which hear what is useful, but such as are open only to things that pertain to pleasure; for any one would be healed, if he were

¹ Strom. III. 16. p. 488.

² Strom. VII. 16. p. 530.

only willing to obey the truth. There is a three-fold mode of curing this conceitedness, as also every affection; a knowledge of the cause; how it may be removed; and, thirdly, the systematic exercise and custom of the soul to be able to follow the things it rightly decides upon."¹

Clement also believed in the influences of the Holy Ghost in changing the heart, as is sufficiently evident from a clause in which he speaks of "the new man transformed by the Holy Spirit of God."²

Origen. He, like his predecessors, believed in the three-fold nature of man, body, soul, and spirit, of which the spirit, *πνεῦμα*, is the best, as not being infected with sin, and as existing in the conscience, and being able to discern the Holy Spirit, which is efficacious in the saints. The soul, though one substance, consists of two parts, the rational and the irrational. And the irrational is again divided into the two affections of desire and anger. This soul is capable of good and evil, and holds a middle rank between the body and the spirit. The body is a temporary and troublesome adjunct; and by its lusts, is often the seat and cause of sin to the soul. The human soul is immaterial and invisible, and has some affinity to God; while the soul of a brute, is its blood.³

Concerning *free-will*, he had at least as exalted an opinion as that already extracted from Clement.

He regarded it as the grand characteristic and prime glory of a rational being; and contends that whoever denies this free-will, virtually denies, not merely our responsibility as moral agents, but our power to reason, and even our very consciousness.

But it may be well to give a specimen of his own language on this topic. We shall thus see, if I mistake not, that the same things were then thought and said, which we now hear repeated,—and perhaps something more. Here as elsewhere, it is my design in the passages marked in half-quotation, not only to do justice to the sentiments of the author, but to give an exact translation of all the terms which are particularly important to the leading sentiments of the passage, or to the chief question I have in view. The passage from which I first draw is found in his work on prayer, where he is answering the old objection from decrees—an objection which every caviller down to the

¹ Strom. p. 526.

² Cohort. 11. p. 176.

³ For proofs, see Guer. II. p. 228 sq.

present time, supposes to be a new and sage discovery of his own. This objection, Origen states in all its strength, and in a variety of forms. The following is one of these forms. "Any particular individual is either one of those who were elected before the foundation of the world, and who cannot possibly fall from this election, and therefore he need not pray; or he was not elected nor predestinated, and he prays in vain; and should he pray a thousand times, he would not be heard."—"For the solution of objections which thus go to paralyse prayer, I think the following things may profitably be premised." He then goes on to speak of the different kinds of motion of which different kinds of things are susceptible, as stones, plants, and animals; and speaks of them as either moved from *without* or from *within*. 'The third kind of motion is that of animals; which is called motion *from themselves*. But the motion of *rational beings*, I think is motion *of themselves*, δι' αὐτῶν. But if we take away from an animal this motion *from himself*, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, he can no longer be recognized as an animal, but will be either like a plant which is moved by nature only, or like a stone which is impelled by something from abroad. But if any one follows his own motion, since we may call this *being moved by himself*, it is necessarily rational. They, therefore, who will have nothing to be in our power, must necessarily admit this most foolish thing; first, that we are not living beings; and, secondly, that we are not rational. But, as if moved by some one from abroad and not moving ourselves, we may be said to do *by him*, what we think *ourselves* to do. Besides, let any one understandingly inspect the things of which himself is the subject, and see if he can shamelessly say, that he does not himself will, and he does not himself eat, and does not himself walk, nor himself assent to receive some opinions, nor discard others as false. As, then, there are some dogmas to which a man can never be induced, although ten thousand times over he artfully arranges the proofs for this purpose and employs persuasive language; so it is impossible that any one should be brought so to think of human things as though nothing were left in our power. For, who settles down in the belief, that nothing is comprehensible?—And who is there that does not blame the son that fails in filial duty? or blame and censure the adulteress as base? For the truth impels and necessitates one, in spite of a myriad of plausible things he may invent, to break forth in such cases, either in applauses

or censures, as though there were something still kept in our power as the foundation of praise and blame.'

'But if freewill is preserved to us, with its ten thousand propensities to virtue or to vice; and again, with its propensities to what is fitting or to what is improper; all this, together with other things, was necessarily known to God, before it took place, i. e. from the creation and foundation of the world just as it was to be. And in all things which God foreordains, accordingly as he foresaw respecting each act of our freewill, his decree was according to what was requisite to each movement of our freewill, and what would be meet for himself, on the part of 'providence, and to what was to occur according to the connexion of the things to take place; yet, not that the foreknowledge of God is the cause of all things that are to take place and that are to be produced from our freewill, according to our spontaneous action. For even on the supposition that God did not know future events, we could not, on that ground, boast that we should do these things and think these things. But this advantage on the other hand accrues from foreknowledge, viz. that each thing in our power receives an assignation in the arrangement of the universe which is beneficial to the condition of the world.'¹

It might be gratifying to go on with his argument, and see how he avails himself of these principles, in removing the objection to prayer, as above stated; but it would be rather foreign to our present purpose. Enough is already involved in these statements to show that Origen believed in the perfect freedom of man, while, at the same time, he also believed in the perfect foreknowledge and foreordination of God.

Origen, moreover, believed in our dependence on divine influence, in some sense, to aid freewill in the performance of duty. According to the translation of Rufinus, "he pronounced man's purpose alone, and by itself, to be inadequate to the consummation of good, for it is by divine aid that it is led to whatever is perfected."² But his sentiments on this point will more fully appear from the following statement, which he thus begins, in the style of a truly biblical scholar. 'In *one place* the apostle does not ascribe it to God, that a vessel is formed to honour or to dishonour, but refers the whole to us, saying, *if any one shall purify himself, he shall be a vessel sanctified unto honour, and use-*

¹ De Orat. 6. p. 432 sq.

² De Princip. III. c. 2. 2.

ful to the master, as prepared to every good work. In another place, he does not ascribe it to us, but seems to refer the whole to God, saying, *The potter hath power over the clay to make of the same lump one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour.* Now the things spoken by him, are not contradictory; and we must therefore reconcile both; and derive from both one perfect sense. Neither is our liberty without the wise efficiency, *ἐπιστημὴν*, of God; nor does this efficiency of God necessitate us to proceed in our course unless we also conduce somewhat to the good that is effected. Neither does freewill cause any one to be unto honour or to dishonour, without the efficiency of God, and the disposal, *κατάχρησις*, of what is according to the dignity of our freewill. Nor does the will of God *alone* form any one to honour or to dishonour, unless he have some matter of difference inclining the choice to the worse or the better.¹

But while it is thus plain, that Origen held both to freewill and to our dependence on divine influence, it is, at the same time, still more abundantly plain, that both he and Clement belonged to that class of divines who feel it incumbent on them to put forth all their strength in vindication of human freedom. Rarely does he mention dependence; and then, almost always, with some saving clause to guard against an encroachment on 'the prime glory of man.'

This extreme caution, *all on one side*, doubtless contributed to bring his orthodoxy into suspicion, and to curtail the influence and the usefulness of his writings, in subsequent ages. We may also well suppose, that, in its consequences it gave occasion, in a subsequent age, for the extreme leaning of Augustine in the opposite direction. The like extremes have been alternately producing each other, down to the present day: and especially since the time of Arminius. And this extreme propensity, in these early christian philosophers, was doubtless occasioned by their abhorrence of the stoical doctrines of fate.

Origen's opinions respecting the pre-existence of human souls, and the occasion of their being doomed to this earthly condition, have already been adduced, while considering the subject of creation.

As to *man's depravity*, Origen taught, that although the soul comes into the world, under the load, and for the punishment,

¹ De Princip. c. 1. 22.

of guilt contracted in a previous state, still it has the image of God. He however makes a distinction between the *image* and the *similitude* of God; and considers our image of God, as nothing but the image of the Word, who is the true image of God. Still he did not uniformly adhere to this distinction. He thus expresses himself, as appears by the Latin of Rufinus: "But if any one dares to attribute substantial corruption to him who was made after the image and similitude of God, he extends the cause of impiety, as I think, even to the Son of God himself. For he is called, in Scripture, the image of God. Or he who thus decides will certainly impugn the authority of Scripture, which asserts that man was made after the image of God; in whom the marks of the divine image are manifestly recognized, not in the form of the body, which form is marred, but by prudence of mind, by justice, by moderation, by fortitude, by wisdom, by skill, and finally, by the whole chorus of virtues, which, since they are in God by substance, may be in man by industry and by imitation of God; as the Lord also points out in the gospel, saying, *Be ye also merciful, as your Father is merciful*; and *Be ye perfect, as your Father is perfect*. Hence it is evidently shown, that in God all these virtues always exist; nor can they ever accede or depart; but to men, each one is acquired singly and by degrees," etc.¹

He elsewhere speaks of this image, as delineated in man at the beginning, and still preserved, although always polluted with sins.²

As to the *hisotry of Adam*, Origen thinks much of it to be an allegory, representing real facts in sensible images. "Who is such a fool," he exclaims, "as to think that God, in the manner of a husbandman, planted a garden eastward in Eden, and made in it a visible and tangible tree of life, so that life might have been acquired by tasting its fruit with bodily teeth?" etc.³

Again, he thus chastises Celsus for cavilling at the account of the creation of Eve from a rib taken from the side of Adam while asleep. "Nor does he produce the passage, which itself might make the hearer understand, that it was spoken figuratively; and he was not willing to appear to know, that such things are interpreted allegorically."⁴ He then goes on to show

¹ De Princip. IV. 37. p. 403.

² See Guer. II. p. 234.

³ Guer. 16. p. 354.

⁴ Con. Cels. IV. 38. p. 514.

that these things may as properly be interpreted allegorically, as what Hesiod has said about Pandora, etc.

A few pages further on, he takes up the following invective of the same caviller. "*The account given by Moses, says Celsus, most impiously introduces God as being feeble even from the beginning, and unable to persuade even a single man, whom he formed.*" To this says Origen, 'we shall reply, that the assertion is of similar import as if one should inveigh on the introduction of evil, which God has not been able so to prevent that even any one man has been found, from the beginning, who has not tasted of evil. And now, in like manner as in this case where those who are careful to vindicate providence, vindicate it by no few nor contemptible arguments, so likewise in respect to Adam and his sin will they philosophize, who know that in Hebrew the word *Adam* signifies *man*; and that in those things which seem to respect Adam, Moses gives a philosophical account of things belonging to the nature of man in general. *For in Adam, as the Word says, all die, and are condemned in the similitude of Adam's transgression.* Thus the divine Word speaks these things not so much concerning any one, in particular, as concerning the whole race. For in the course of the things spoken of as belonging to one, that which belonged to Adam is common to all men; and those respecting the woman, are not spoken respecting her merely. And the man, expelled from Paradise with his wife, and clothed with coats of skin, (which God made for sinning men on account of their transgression,) contains some secret and mystic import, far superior to that of the soul, which, according to Plato, shed its wings and fell down hitherward till it could find something firm to stand on."¹

Origen, in his commentary on Romans and elsewhere, informs us of this lofty and mystic import of the coats of skin, etc. He supposes Paradise to be heaven, where souls were placed at their creation, and from which they were expelled by reason of their defection, and sent into this lower world. The skins, with which our first parents were clothed, were their earthly bodies. And he supposes each one to be sent into just such a situation as the degree of his previous guilt has merited. This theory of his, which has already been more fully detailed under the topic of *Creation*, taken in its connexion with his views of freewill, was

¹ Con. Cels. IV. 40. p. 524.

his grand solvent for all the difficult questions that can be brought from those two prolific sources of trouble to the speculating world, *the origin of evil* and *the diversities of human condition* to which men are here born. He gloried greatly in this theory, as enabling him to meet such objections much better than those gnostics could, who had devised, for the same purpose, the figment of an original difference in the souls of men, as first created, which laid the foundation for their different allotments in this life.¹

From the above, it would seem, that Origen's views of *original sin*, could not be the same as those afterwards inculcated by Augustine, especially as regards its connexion with Adam. According to Origen, our souls all fell into different degrees of sin before Adam came into this life, and even before the creation of this world. But though man is thus a sinner before he is born, yet Origen supposes sin in him to be dead during infancy; and then to revive again in mature years. He also supposes man to be naturally prone to sin; and that all have in fact sinned, except the man Christ Jesus. He also speaks of a corporal necessity of sinning; by which, however, he seems only to mean a powerful propensity or temptation, arising from the appetites and passions, and especially from the passion against which he was so prompt to place a thorough guard. In these cases he supposes we may sin without any temptation from Satan. The style in which he philosophizes on this point, is much the same with what has since been employed. The desire for natural good becomes too strong for restraint by moral precepts, while reason and experience are yet immature. Among other instances which he brings he thus speaks of temperance in eating, with regard both to the kind and quantity of food which may be innocently received. His ethics here, as elsewhere, are close and discriminating. "I do not indeed think," says he, "that this could have been so observed by men, although there had been no incitement of the devil, that no one would have exceeded the proper limits in food, before they had learnt it by long use and experience." Just so of other human affections, as sorrow, anger, love of money, etc.²—Still he believed at least enough in satanic influence. As one illustration of his faith on this part of anthropology, I may here remark, that, in this same connexion, he speaks of the de-

¹ See Princip. II. c. 9. 6. sq.

² See Princip. III. c. 2. 2.

vil as taking possession of those passions and appetites, which men will not restrain, and driving the self-resigned victims to distraction, in the courses to which they give up themselves. Thus men become mad through love, grief, anger, avarice, etc. He also speaks of other causes of sin, such as example.

But notwithstanding his prevailing delight in such views as these, on the subject of human sin in this world, there are still some passages in his works, in which he holds language of apparently a different strain. Thus he assigns the sinfulness of infants as the reason for their being baptized, under the new dispensation, and of sacrifices being offered for them, under the old. The following is one instance. "But the prophets, designing to indicate something wise respecting matters of generation, say that sacrifice is offered for sin, even for those just born, as not being free from sin. They even say, *I was conceived in sin*, etc. and they also show, that sinners are alienated from their birth; strangely affirming this, too, that *they went astray from the womb, they spoke lies*."¹ Were it not for the passages of Scripture here adduced, we might suppose Origen to have in his mind the sins committed in their former state. As it is, perhaps he would explain himself as referring, in some measure, to the sinfulness of character they there contracted. But how he would show the consistency of what he here intimates, with his notion, 'that innate sinfulness is dormant in infancy,' it is at least difficult, if not impossible, to imagine.

Again, in commenting on Romans, he speaks of the 'double sense to be given to the phrase, *body of sin*. According to one of these senses, the body consists of our lusts, of which fornication, avarice, etc. are members, and the devil is the head. The other sense is the literal one, in which the apostle may be understood to have pronounced our very body *a body of sin*, which is to be received according to the import in which David said of himself, *I was conceived in sin*, etc. The apostle, likewise, in other places says, *Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?* And again, he calls our body *a body of weakness*. But concerning the Saviour, he says, in a certain place, that he came *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, that *for sin he might condemn sin in the flesh*. In this the apostle shows, that *our flesh is*, indeed, the flesh of sin; but the flesh of Christ is only *like* the

¹ Con. Cels. VII. 50. p. 362.

flesh of sin; for it was not conceived from the seed of man, but *the Holy Spirit came upon Mary, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her*, etc.—The body of sin is, therefore, *our* body. Neither is Adam described as having known his wife Eve and begotten Cain, until after sin. And finally, in the law it is commanded, that a sacrifice be offered for an infant who should be born, *a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons*; one of them as an offering for sin, and the other as a burnt offering. For what sin is this young bird offered? Can the child just born, have sinned? And yet it *has sin*, for which a sacrifice is commanded to be offered, and by which it is denied that any one is clean, no not even if his life be that of but a single day. Concerning this, therefore, even David is believed to have said what we have above related, *in sins did my mother conceive me*. For, according to history, no sin of his mother is mentioned. On this account, too, the church has received a tradition, to give baptism even to little children, *parvulis*. For they, to whom the secrets of the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is, in all, the natural filth of sin, which needs to be washed away by water and the Spirit; on account of which filth, even the body itself is called a body of sin; not, as is supposed by some of those who introduce the transmigration of souls into various bodies, for the offences which the soul committed in some other body, but for the very thing that is effected in the body of sin and body of death and weakness.¹

As his commentary on Romans is extant only in the Latin translation by Rufinus, the above passage is doubtless more diffuse than the original; yet we need not doubt its substantial authenticity, especially as the same sentiments are elsewhere found in the writings of Origen.

In commenting on the phrase, *let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies*, he says that this passage teaches us that “sin has a kind of seat and kingdom in the body.” And a little farther on, he says that “the apostle pronounces all sins to be works of the flesh.—But if you inquire how even *heresies* are numbered among the works of the flesh, you will find them to proceed from the sense of the flesh; for thus the apostle speaks concerning a certain one, *in vain puffed up by the sense of his flesh, and not holding the head*.”²

¹ Com. in Rom. L. V. 9. p. 263 sq.

² Com. in Rom. L. VI. 1. p. 274.

From his last remark, it is obvious, that Origen, kind as he was to the heretics, had still the same view of the 'source of the disease,' as that already quoted from his predecessor, i. e. the sinful propensities of men.

It may now be well, again to turn the tablet, and read awhile on the other side, lest a false impression be left of the prevailing views of the great metaphysician, on the nature and origin of human sin. And as the assertion has already been made, that he considered sin as dormant, during our infancy, we will look at a passage which will authenticate this assertion, in connexion with other matters to our present purpose.

Commenting on Romans, he comes to the following declarations of the apostle: "*For without the law, sin is dead. Yes I was alive without the law once. But when the commandment came, sin revived and I died*, etc. Concerning most of these things," continues Origen, "I have distinctly treated above; therefore, that we may not too frequently revolve the same things, we will briefly recall to memory what was said. Sin then without law, is dead in us, i. e. before the rational capacity through age becomes vigorous within us, as I showed when I adduced the example of a boy striking or reproaching his father or mother. In this, according to the law which forbids one to strike his father or mother, sin appears to be committed. But this sin is said to be dead, because the law is not yet present in the boy, to teach him, that what he does is not lawful. But now it is certain, that Paul, and that all men, were once alive without this law, i. e. in their puerile age; because all, through this period, are alike incapable of this natural law. For how can Paul be proved ever to have lived without the law of Moses, since he confesses himself to have been a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and circumcised the eighth day, according to the precepts of the law? But, in the manner I have mentioned, even he lived once, viz. in childhood, without natural law. At which time he does not say, there is no sin in man; but that sin is dead and afterwards revives, when natural law coming begins to prohibit concupiscence: which law revives sin, as though it were dead. For this is the nature of sin, viz. for that to take place, which law forbids to take place."

"*But sin reviving, I died*, says the apostle. *I*, Who? Doubtless the *soul*, which had done what the law forbade. For the prophet says, *the soul that sinneth it shall die*. The command, therefore, which had been given unto life, i. e. to the *soul*

to teach it the works of life, is found to yield death unto it, since the soul does not so much fly from the prohibited objects, as the more ardently seek them."

"Here I am led to the question, How he should speak of sin as having been dead and reviving again. For it is plain, that a thing cannot be pronounced dead, unless it has once been alive and afterwards ceased to live. And likewise this very affirmation, it *revived*, indicates, not a life lately given, but *æa* former one restored; for the word *revived* signifies *to live again*." Origen then refutes 'the notion of transmigration, from the consideration, that our souls could not have committed sin, while inhabiting the bodies of beasts, birds and fishes, where they could have known no law, and could therefore have been guilty of no transgression.' And then he adds: "But we say, that this death of sin was given, by the favour of God, at the time when we were living without law;" i. e. in infancy, when we were incapable of knowing law.—"That is called law, which teaches what ought to be done, and what to be avoided, and it is necessary that it teach what sort of a thing that is which is to be avoided, that it may thereby be more easily avoided. For no one can avoid that of which he is ignorant." This principle, Origen seems to have introduced here for the purpose of substantiating the position just assumed, that there can be no sin where there is not a law *actually understood*; and also for the further purpose of showing, that sin is not to be charged on the law, nor consequently on the Lawgiver. The first object is manifest from what he had just said about the dormancy of sin in children; and the last is equally manifest from the sentence with which he follows his remark, which is this. "If any one, therefore, when informed, by the law, of what he ought to avoid, instead of avoiding, does the thing, he will appear indeed to have received, by occasion of the law, the knowledge of not doing the thing: but the law had not therefore taught him in order that he should do what he ought not, and die; but that he should not do, and live. *Thus, then, sin, taking occasion by the commandment, seduced me, and by it slew me.*"¹ And it may be remarked, that sin, here, according to Origen, may mean the serpent; or it may mean sin personified.

Thus we see how the great catechist of the third century, "reasoned high" on the mysteries of man. In many things, his positions and his reasoning were just the same as have since been

¹ Com. in Rom. Lib. VI. 8. p. 301 sq.

employed by some men in every age down to the present, especially in respect to human freedom, and the nature of sin. At the same time, we see in him what now appears the perfection of extravagance in a man who not only had the Bible, but who manifestly studied it with an intensity and perseverance and acuteness, that have rarely been equalled. Honesty will also compel the acknowledgment, from the attentive reader of his pages, that his reverence for inspiration, was as profound as his learning; nor can we suspect him of a wilful or a negligent perversion. And while he is full of philosophical theory, he seems always equally intent on proving the truth of his speculations by the Scripture, and of justifying, by these same theories, the ways of God to men. Yes; and even in his wildest notions, the man who will patiently listen to his whole argument, will hardly know which most to wonder at, the strangeness of his hypothesis, or the number of texts he will plausibly adduce in its proof, and which, in turn, he will as plausibly explain by it.—And, then, as to the perspicuity and reach of his intellect in the weaving of theories, perhaps the whole world may be safely challenged to produce, aside from *revelation*, an equally sublime and consistent system on the origin and progress of sinful beings under a righteous and omniscient Providence. Give him his supposed *facts* respecting the antemundane state of souls, and all is much clearer, in the eye of such philosophy as will admit no mystery, than much of what is even now cherished, in divers christian systems respecting man.—A most prolific source of error, with this and others of the early fathers, was that of being literal where they should be figurative, and figurative where they should be literal, in their interpretations of Scripture. And in many cases, we can now only conjecture whether their philosophy misguided their interpretation, or their interpretation bewildered their philosophy.—Thanks to God for the rock of inspiration! It still remains the same. And thanks to him for the more chastened circumspection, with which the tedious discussions of centuries have compelled philosophy, in many respects, to decipher the deeper mysteries engraven upon this eternal rock. While simple faith has always read its chief import right, and always will, profounder investigation will find increasing occasion, as it reads and thinks, to rejoice that the *Origens*, are among the men that *have* been. His good thoughts, which were many, have done good ever since he wrote them, and will do good forever; and his vain thoughts, however great the evil

they have occasioned, are not in vain to the progress of the human mind. They have filled, and, by filling, they now guard a large space in the field of possible conjecture, from the excursions of curious and aspiring minds. *Actum est.* The effect of reading his works, is a more exalted and grateful estimate of the truths of revelation, leaving all mysteries, in the study of man, just where the Maker of man has thus seen fit to leave them.

As to the charge of self-contradiction in the writings of Origen, perhaps the shortest way for his admirers will be to admit it, on some points, particularly that of the moral state of infants; and then to bring the like charge against every unflinching philosopher who has written even half as much, on themes so intricate. And if their defenders bring explanations, the friends of Origen may then urge, that his 'dead sin in the bodies of infants, though not a transgression of law, nor deserving of punishment,' is still such as to lay the foundation for baptism in their case. The explanations may chance to be equally plausible,—and equally beyond the boundaries of human reason.

It would be interesting to trace the extent to which the more immediate successors of Origen, followed him in his peculiar speculations on anthropology; but our means are scanty. Such as they are, however, we now proceed with them.

Dionysius, A. D. 233—267. It is plain that this father held to man's freedom, while he also believed God to be the efficient cause of whatever is good in man. Thus he speaks, as quoted by Guerike: "For the one fountain of wisdom, is God—who is the one originating cause and giver of wisdom; and if any one partakes of it, he has it as receiving it from him;—and in his hand are we also, and our reason and intelligence and practical skill; for from no other source came there ever into us any thing good or admirable; but if there is any thing good, it is of him; and any thing beautiful, it is from him."¹—He did not, like Origen, consider the history of Adam an allegory.²

Pierius, A. D. 265—282. This teacher seems "faintly to have intimated the pre-existence of souls, according to the notions of Origen."³

¹ E Niceta apud Routh. Reliqu. Sacr. II. 406 sq. Guer. II. 309.

² Routh. ib. p. 395. sq.

³ Guer. II. p. 325.

Peter Martyr, A. D. 295—312. His first discourse on the soul, is entitled, "On the soul as having not previously existed, nor being placed in the body in a sinning state." In this discourse, he says: "It is not to be admitted, that souls sinned in heaven, before they had bodies; nor that they existed at all before their bodies; for this doctrine belongs to Grecian philosophy, and is foreign and adverse to those who would live godly in Christ."¹

Didymus, A. D. 340—395. From this distinguished follower of Origen, we may well expect something more on this subject than we have found from the intermediate teachers.

Didymus treats largely of the three-fold nature of man, as consisting of spirit, soul, and body, like his distinguished predecessors of early date. It will be needless to cite passages, as the general view of this theory has already been given.

In respect to the *body*, it may be briefly remarked, that he did not regard it as evil by nature. His argument is this: "If God is glorified in the body of man, as set forth in 1 Cor. 6:20, and God is not glorified in evil, then the body is not by nature evil." And further: "If it is by nature evil, it cannot receive sanctification. If, then, it receives sanctification, it manifestly cannot be evil by nature. For whatever is by nature evil, cannot receive good; as on the other hand, what is by nature good, cannot receive evil."²

Guerike remarks, that a few vestiges of the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls are to be found in this author. He considered the souls of the elect to be spoken of by Peter, in the commencement of his first epistle, as sojourning here below, in the character of strangers upon earth, and who had come from another world.³

On *freewill*, he speaks in decisive tones, and wholly in its favour. Still he regards man, in his present condition, as in a diseased state. "The soul suffers in consequence of its connexion with the body and its own proper will and choice and appetite for knowledge. For since the body holds it shut up within itself in blind custody, by material passions it draws away the soul from consort with God, and inclines it, as I believe, down-

¹ Routh. p. 346, sq. Guer. II. p. 327.

² Contr. Manich. p. 207. sq. Guer. II. p. 360.

³ Guer. II. p. 361.

ward to earth and earthly solicitudes ; and thus it strives to rule the soul, which, by nature, is more noble, and as much more noble, as that which is immortal is more excellent than that which is mortal. Moreover, the desire of gratifying its own will, and of acquiring knowledge, draws it thither, and to that it tends, as it wishes to know certain things ; and since it has not a correct and safe guide for the way, or uses the custom of depraved men, the soul loses its way and hesitates in doubt, and at length inconsiderately embraces some opinion to which it may chance to be borne, and thus it is most miserable, because while seeking for good knowledge, and thinking itself to have found it, the soul falls into base opinions and is depraved.”¹ “Hence,” he remarks in another place, “it is not wonderful, if men do otherwise than he wishes from whom they have received their power.”²

It was also his view, that a creature cannot either be impeccable, or of himself put away his sins. “Original sin is inherent in us ; that sin in which all are by succession from Adam.” “We are all born in sin.” He held to the fall from a state of pristine holiness ; and understood the history of Adam literally. “The first image was lost,” and that which we now bear, is far different from that of primitive beauty. Through Christ “we recover the delineated image and likeness of God, which we received by the divine inflation, and lost by sin ; and we are again found such as we were made at the first formation, without sin, and possessing freedom of will.” Nor did he suppose little children to sin ; “but they are prevented by their age, not by virtue.” He did not suppose sin to be *natural*, nor did he understand Paul so to teach, in Eph. 2 : 3, where he supposes the apostle to mean by *φύσιν*, *truly*. Nor did he regard our wills as evil substances ; nor Judas to be, in this sense, evil. Didymus, therefore, thought that there was a continued series of sinful acts, proceeding from the fall of Adam onward, but denied the wickedness of man to be natural, or rather *physical*.

Such is the sketch which Guerike presents, and for which he cites authorities.³ It should be borne in mind, that much of what Didymus says against the doctrine that sin is by nature, appears

¹ De Trin. III. 1.

² Enarr. in I Pet. 2 : 12.

³ Guer. II. p. 363 sq.

to be said against the Manichaeans, who doubtless held to *physical depravity*, if any beings ever held to it.

This closes our summary view of these ancient doctors, on *the nature of man*. It is needless to add, that the same discussions which are still so rife on this prolific subject, resounded in the halls of that primitive seat of clerical science, for more than two centuries ;—and nearly in the same style, at least on one side of the great subject. The inference to be drawn from this historical fact, if inference there be in favour of either side of the main question, belongs rather to the province of the reader, than to the scope of my present design.

There are, however, two queries, which, it may be hoped, will not be thought out of place, if here proposed for the consideration of those more particularly interested in the past history and present state of dogmatic discussion. The first question respects the progress that has actually been made in this important but most belligerous department. How far has the arena been narrowed? and what are the points that have been actually settled? Doubtless there are some: The vagaries of Origen respecting the pre-existence of souls and some connected topics, though they found advocates in this same school till its close, a period of nearly two hundred years, have long ago been abandoned. An immense number of texts in the Bible, which were once of contested interpretation, have also been settled, in the view of disputants, at least so far as anthropology is concerned. We are, therefore, with gratitude, to acknowledge a real advance. But how great is this advance, and how "much land yet remains to be possessed" in peace? and what *proportion* of the boundaries of truth on this subject, have yet been agreed upon? Is it one half? or only the one thousandth part of what have generally constituted the chief matters of contest? And, furthermore, (a very important part of the inquiry surely,) what advance has been made in settling the *preliminaries* that are requisite to a final and complete adjustment of what remains in controversy?—such preliminaries, for example, as the canons of sacred interpretation,—the legitimate style of philosophizing on moral subjects,¹—the relative weight to be given to Scripture and to mere philosophy,—and the order of precedence in which these shall be studied by the men who are to be guides to this adjustment.

¹ Is the truly inductive method yet fully agreed upon here?

When the above question is well pondered, there remains yet a second, viz. When may this desired adjustment be rationally expected to take place? Considering what has already been done, and at what expense of time and labour, and in how long a course of years, how much longer will it take? and when may the loftiest minds in the church be all free for other work? Let this be deemed neither an idle nor a carping question. Unless I greatly mistake, it is one of the most important and most practical that the page of history has to suggest, in respect to the future. Let it be thoroughly considered and soundly answered, and how can it then fail greatly to modify the style of discussion, and the style of feeling, on this whole subject? And if rational prospect be better than blind presumption, how can this modification fail of being beneficial? While rational expectations will not paralyse the muscle of proper effort, who can tell the amount of self-confidence, and contempt, and reviling, and denunciation, and violence, and final disappointment, that such chastened expectations would prevent, on both sides? And who can tell how much they would conspire to hasten, instead of retarding, the consummation so devoutly to be wished?

But in order to answer the question, something more will be needed than the survey of that little though important nook in this part of dogmatic history which we have just inspected. Not only are the long and laborious lives of such men as Clement, and Origen, and Didymus, to be considered; but the whole tide of life, down to the present day, which has flowed in the same agitating channel, is to be explored. There are the voluminous toils of Augustine and his immediate followers and opponents, to be inspected. There are the endless and ineffable subtleties of the acute schoolmen, who confidently assayed to settle forever the points that are still up. Then come the great Reformers, for half a century; then the popes, with their *Congregation of aids*; then Armenius with his friends and his foes; and finally our own Edwards, "that king of the Calvinists," with all who have followed and all who have opposed him. To all these, should be added all the unconsecrated hands that have been put to the work, both heathen and christian, from Plato and Aristotle to Locke, and from Locke to Brown.—When, then, the whole mighty host, with all their achievements, are surveyed, shall we say, or can we even hope, that all which remains unsettled in the views of men, on this subject, is to be adjusted by a single writer, or in a single age? Or shall we on the contrary

expect that the discussion will go on, somewhat as it has done for two thousand years, with some improvement in matter, and more in manner, till the dispute shall imperceptibly subside ; or till God may see fit to raise up a mighty genius for the work, who shall not aim at present effect, or personal or party triumph, but like a first-rate poet who scorns all contests with the men that be, shall devote his life to the high purpose of illuminating and swaying the world in a coming age?—But I am well aware, that it may be found much easier to tell what will *not* be, for the present, than to conjecture what *will* be at some future day ; and this too, is probably much more beneficial, for all concerned, in the present case.

VII. THE FUTURE STATE OF MAN.

We turn, now, to a connected subject, and inquire for the views of these same fathers respecting the allotments of Providence concerning man in the eternal world.

Athenagoras, A. D. 160—181. The following, according to *Guerike*,¹ is the substance of what *Athenagoras* maintained, solely from human reason, in his book *on the Resurrection*. In the future resurrection, the elements of the first body will receive again the same soul ; a body indeed, not liable to pain nor corruption. To prove this he most sagaciously shows, in the first place, that God is destitute of neither the efficiency nor the will to resuscitate the body. The *efficiency*, including both the requisite power and the knowledge, he proves from the work of creation ; and defends his position against objections brought by gentile philosophers, from the fact, that some human bodies have been devoured by beasts or by men, etc. The *will* he proves from this consideration, that it will neither be unjust, to recall the dead to life, either to those who rise, in respect to body or soul, or to other creatures besides them ; nor will it be unworthy of God : which last point, he proves from creation, as it will be worthy of him who made us at first, to resuscitate us again. He then gives the grounds of his position. First ; it is the end of man ; which is seen in this, that he is the perpetual spectator of the divine wisdom. Secondly ; the common nature and condition of men, to which a perpetual life is needful in

¹ *Guer.* II. p. 104.

order to the attainment of the object of rational life. Thirdly ; the judgment of the Creator concerning men, is necessary both on account of the providence and the justice of God ; and as it is the whole man that acts, both soul and body, so the whole man should be subjected to the judgment. And finally ; the supreme good of man, or his final end, which is not found in this life.

From such positions as these, we are left to infer his views concerning man's future state, in a variety of respects, which it is needless to detail.

Clement, A. D. 190—213. In a fragment from the lost book of Clement on the soul, he says : "The souls of all, as they are breathed forth, have the faculty of life ; and, though separated from the body, they are found to possess a love for it. The immortal are wafted to the bosom of God ; as the vapours of the earth, exhaled by the rays of the sun in winter, are borne to him."¹

From this, it appears, that he believed in the separate existence of souls after death. And from what is to follow, it will but too plainly appear, that in this separate state, he supposed them to pass through a kind of purgatory. His doctrine was doubtless derived from heathen philosophy ; but his argument is, that the philosophers derived this, like many other doctrines, from the Jews, and so from revelation itself. Thus he speaks concerning "the Ephesian," (doubtless Heraclitus,) from whom he had just quoted a passage ; "for he himself knew (having learnt it from the barbarous philosophy) the purification, by fire, of those who had lived wickedly, which the Stoics afterwards called a *burning out*, ἐκπύρωσις."² And further on, he says : "Now the punishments and vengeance by fire after death, both all the poets and all the Grecian philosophers stole from the barbarous philosophy,"³ i. e. from the Jewish,

¹ Potter, p. 1020. Guer. II. p. 161.

² Strom. V. 1. p. 16.

³ Strom. 14. p. 116. In fact, the latter part of this fifth book, is almost wholly occupied with quotations from heathen poets and a few other heathen writers, for the purpose of showing what they had derived from the Old Testament and had adopted, with greater or less alterations. In this exhibition of his great acquaintance with heathen literature he also shows his fanciful interpretation of many passages of Scripture, and his credulity in trusting to very slight analo-

which the Greeks scornfully denominated *barbarous*; as indeed they did all that was not Grecian.

These fathers, holding as they did, that heathen philosophy derived its doctrines of the future state from the Jews, were, of course, much more willing to adopt them nearly as a whole, than they would otherwise have been. Hence the readiness to retain the heathen purgatory.

But to proceed with our author. After saying that it is not simply faith, however great, that will save us, but that it must be accompanied by works; and that it is needful for one to put off his vices, if he would attain his appropriate abode; Clement says: "But it is greater *to know* than *to believe*; just as it is something greater than salvation, for one, after he is saved, to be counted worthy of the highest honour. When, therefore, our believer through much discipline has put off his passions, he takes his exit to the greatest chastisement, which is superior to his former abode, to bear what is peculiar to penitence, τὸ ἰδιόματι μετανοίας, for sins committed after baptism. He, therefore, still suffers more, while he has not yet attained, or may never attain, what he sees others enjoying. Moreover, he is afflicted with shame for his faults; which indeed are the greatest punishments to the believer. For God's justice is good, and his goodness is just. And if the punishments should at any time cease in the complete satisfaction for offences, and the purification of each individual, they still have the greatest grief remaining, because they are found worthy of a different mansion, and cannot enter that of those who are glorified by righteousness."¹

This passage might suffice to give us some general outline of the views of Clement respecting a future purgatory for the punishment and purification of sins committed *after baptism*.

gies. It, however, abundantly shows his strong faith in the general position he supports, and forbids us to wonder how he came so readily to place confidence in the speculations of heathenism. In conclusion, he says: "Since it is now clearly shown, as I think, how it is to be understood that the Greeks were called thieves, by the Lord, I willingly pass by the dogmas of the philosophers; for were we to enter upon their sayings, we should soon collect a sufficient multitude of their commentaries to show, that all the wisdom among the Greeks was derived from the barbarous philosophy."—Strom. near the end, p. 172.

¹ Strom. VI. 14. p. 302 sq.

Those committed before, he supposed to be freely pardoned. But if we would gain any thing like adequate views of the speculations of this philosopher, respecting the future state, we must listen to further and more extended extracts.

In another place he thus begins a further development of his system. "But we say, that knowledge differs from wisdom, which comes by teaching; for though whatever is knowledge, *γνώσις*, is at the same time, in all respects, wisdom, *σοφία*; yet whatever is wisdom, is not, in all respects, knowledge. For the term *wisdom* is understood only of such knowledge as is communicated by language; while not to doubt concerning God, but to believe, is the foundation of knowledge. Now Christ is both the foundation and the superstructure; by whom are also the beginning and the end. And the extremes, both the beginning and the end, are not taught; I mean faith and love. But knowledge which is given in direct communication by the grace of God, *ἐκ παραδόσεως διαδομένη κατὰ χάριν Θεοῦ*, is committed as a deposit to those who show themselves worthy of instruction, from which the worthiness, *ἀξίωμα*, of love, shines forth, from light to light. For it is said, *To him that hath shall be given*. And to faith, knowledge; and to knowledge, love; and to love, the inheritance. And this takes place, when the individual adhesively depends on the Lord through faith, and through knowledge, and through love, and ascends with him up where dwells the God and guardian of our faith and love. Hence to this end, knowledge is communicated to those who are fitted for it and approved, on account of the need of more preparation and previous practice, and for hearing the things which are spoken, and to the moderation of life, and for attaining, by close observation, to something superior to righteousness by law. This knowledge leads us to an eternal and perfect object, teaching us, beforehand, what will be our way of living among gods and near God, when freed from all chastisement and punishment which we endure from our sins for salutary discipline. After which redemption, the reward and honours, are conferred on the perfected, who have now rested from their purification and from all other service, although it be holy and among the holy. After that, there awaits those who have become pure in heart, by their nearness to the Lord, a restoration to the eternal vision; and [they are called by the

appellation of *gods*, and are to be enthroned together with those gods who before received their assignments from the Saviour."¹

In another place, he speaks of his Gnostic, (who is a very different sort of a personage from an *heretical* Gnostic,) as, in the exuberance of his disinterested affection, "pitying those who are chastised after death, and who are induced, by punishment, reluctantly to yield assent."²

The following extract will further develope the views he had formed of the modified heathenism, with which he and others were instrumental in corrupting the church. To understand it more fully, it should be remembered, that he supposed Christ and the apostles to have descended to this purgatory to *preach to the spirits in prison* there, and to baptize them. He also supposed that something more was requisite for Jews, than obedience to the law; and something more for Gentiles than obedience to the dictates of philosophy. "For, to those who were just according to the law, faith was wanting; therefore, when healing such, the Lord said, *thy faith hath saved thee*. But to those who were just according to philosophy, not only was faith in Christ needed, but also an abandonment of idolatry. But immediately, when the truth is revealed to them, they also are filled with regret for what they have done. On this account the Lord preached the gospel also to those in *hades*; for the scripture declares, *Hades saith to destruction, We have not indeed seen his form, but we have heard his voice*. Certainly it was not the place that heard the voice and uttered the words just mentioned, but they who are placed in *hades* and who consigned themselves to destruction, like such as voluntarily plunge into the sea from a vessel. They are therefore the persons who listen to the divine power and voice. For who of sound mind, can suppose the souls both of the just and of sinners to be under one condemnation, and thus overwhelm providence with injustice? What! is it not clear, that Christ preached the gospel to those who were destroyed by the flood; or rather, that were bound and held in prison and custody? I have also already shown, in the second Stroma, that the apostles in conformity to the Lord, preached the gospel to those in *hades*. For it was fit, as I think, there as well as here, that the best of the disciples should be imitators of their master, that while the one led some of the Jews, the others should lead some of the Gentiles to repentance, i. e.

¹ Strom. VII. 10. p. 458 sq.

² ib. 12. p. 492.

those who had indeed lived in righteousness according to the law and according to philosophy ; yet who had passed life, not perfectly but erringly. For it became the divine economy, that those who had rather possessed merit in justice, and those whose lives had been signally commendable, and who repented of their errors, although in another place, being confessedly among those who belong to God the Omnipotent, should be saved according to each one's own knowledge. And the Saviour works, also, as I think, since his work is to save ; which he therefore does by drawing to salvation those who are willing to believe on him, through preaching, wherever they may be. If, then, the Lord descended to *hades* for no other cause but to preach the gospel, since he descended, he either preached to all, or to the Hebrews only. And if to all, then all will be saved who believed, although they may belong to the Gentiles, having there confessed him. For the chastisements of God are salutary and instructive, leading to conversion, and having for their object, rather the repentance than the death of the sinner ; and this especially, since souls disencumbered of the body, can see the more clearly, by no longer having their vision obscured by contemptible flesh, though still darkened by passions. But if he preached the gospel to Jews only, to whom were wanting the acknowledgement and faith through the Saviour, there being now clearly no respect of persons with God, the apostles also, there as here, preached the gospel to such of the Gentiles as were predisposed, *ἐπιρρηδοί*, to conversion. And it is well said by the Shepherd [of Hermas] : *There descended of them therefore into the water ; but these descended alive, and arose alive ; but those who had before slept, descended dead, but arose alive.* Nay, indeed, the gospel also says, that *many of the bodies of those who slept, arose ;* plainly, in order that they might be translated to a better place. There was, therefore, a kind of general movement and transposition, by the economy of the Saviour."¹ The meaning of Clement here, doubtless is, that those who arose at this time, were such as repented at the preaching of Christ, and consequently obtained an *immediate* release ; and this event of the resurrection of some, he regards as a proof of his purgatory. This, it may be remarked, is a little different sort of dream from that of Bishop Horsley, who supposes Christ went to *hades* to reanimate the desponding

¹ Strom. VI. 6. p. 226 sq.

hopes of the ancient saints there, by showing them that he had at length come in the flesh, and that they need not despair of a final deliverance.¹

Clement goes on to argue further, from the justice of God, that as the apostles were commanded to preach the gospel to every creature on earth, in order that those may be without excuse who will not believe, so the gospel must also be preached to those who have died without hearing it, that they likewise may be without excuse, if they will not obey. And this is the way, as he thinks, in which God is to be shown to be good.

The following will cast light on his views of the termination of this state of things; while we shall also incidentally see from them, the mistake of those who assert, that all the election to which the fathers held, before the time of Augustine, was only an "election into the visible church."² Speaking of the importance of being beneficent to the pious, in order to enjoy their prayers, (in his treatise on the question, *What rich man can be saved*,) Clement says: "Now they are faithful, virtuous, devout, and worthy of the appellation which they wear as a diadem. Not only so, but they are the certain elect in the higher sense, τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι, [an election from those elected to external privileges,] and so much the more, as they are the less conspicuous, just bringing themselves into port from the billows of the world, and getting into safety; who do not wish to appear as saints; and if any one call them such, they are covered with shame; in the depth of knowledge hiding the ineffable mysteries, and disdaining that their high birth should be seen by the world; whom the Word calls, *the light of the world and the salt of the earth*. This is the seed, the image and likeness of God, his genuine son and heir, sent here, as into a strange land, by the great economy and fit allotment of the Father, by whom both the visible and the invisible things of the world were made. Some of these things were made for their service; and some for their discipline; and some for their instruction: and all are held together while the seed shall remain here; but when that is gathered, they shall be immediately dissolved."³

¹ See his sermon on Christ's descent into hell, where he attempts to explain and defend the article of "the Church" on the subject.

² See Faber, Vol. I. p. 15, of his dedication.

³ *Quis Dives Salv.* 36. p. 656 sq.

That is, the world will be burnt up as soon as it has answered the divine purposes respecting the elect, and they are gathered in.

Again, in another work, he says : " It is necessary that births and deaths should take place, in creation, until the perfect separation and restoration of the elect ; by which the beings, confusedly mingled in this world, shall be assigned to their appropriate stations."¹

When the world shall be thus dissolved, it would seem that his purgatory must end, and all receive their final allotments for eternity ; for he doubtless, as did Bishop Horsley after him, considered this purgatory to be down in the earth.

Clement held to a resurrection of the body, and wrote a book on the subject, which is now lost. The body, however, to which the soul is to be united after its resurrection, is to be a spiritual body, purified, by the last conflagration, from all the grosser attributes it now possesses, and prepared for a heaven where there is neither male nor female, and they neither marry nor are given in marriage.²

One or two passages more will show the views of Clement in respect to the exaltation and endless progress that await the elect in heaven.

After affirming, that ' the system of salvation has always been the same by one God through the Lord, from the foundation of the world, though under different modes ;' he thus proceeds : " Therefore the middle wall of partition, that divided the Greek from the Jew, is taken away for the peculiar people ; and thus both come to the unity of faith ; and from both, there is the one election, as he saith, there are those more elect than the elect, [elect in the higher sense,] who, according to perfect knowledge, have been selected from the church itself, τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῆς ἀνιηροῦμενοι, and honoured with the most magnificent glory, both as judges and administrators, the four and twenty, [referring to the passage in Revelation, of which he had just before spoken,] equally from Jews and Greeks, the grace being doubled. For in the church here, the gradations of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, are imitations, as I think, of angelic glory, and of that economy which the Scriptures declare to await those who,

¹ Strom. VI. 9. p. 448.

² See Strom. VII. 12. II. 19. Paed. I. 4, 6. I. 10. III. 1.

in the track of the apostles, have lived in perfection according to the gospel. These, exalted to the clouds, writes the apostle, are first to serve as deacons; then, to be ranked among the elders, according to the gradation of glory, (for glory differs from glory,) until they increase to the *perfect man*. Those who are such, according to David, shall rest in the holy mount of God, the supreme church, in which are gathered the philosophers of God, *who are Israelites indeed, pure in heart, in whom is no guile.*"¹

Our author affords us some further information on this high subject in another work. "They who pass from the state of men to that of angels, are instructed under the tuition of angels, a thousand years, having returned finally back to perfection. Then, those who have taken upon themselves the office of teaching, pass into the arch-angelic power. They who have performed the part of learners, receive, in turn, such as are passing from men to angels. Thus, after certain periods already mentioned, they are assigned to the proper and angelic state of body."²

Before dismissing this particular topic, it may be of use to dwell a moment longer on one point which has been incidentally noticed in the course of the above extracts. I refer to the question of *particular election*. Faber, whose assertion has already been mentioned, is not the only man who has undertaken to deny the existence of such a doctrine among the christian fathers before the time of Augustine. On the contrary, the rash assertion having once been made, it is now reiterated loudly from mouth to mouth by such as wish to disprove the doctrine. They would have the world believe that Augustine was the first to teach the doctrine of *personal* and eternal election by God, of those whom he savingly calls into his kingdom. I feel warranted in calling the assertion *rash*, for two reasons. In the first place, it can be but little short of rashness to assert positively concerning *any* religious doctrine, that it is nowhere to be found among the ponderous mass of truth and error contained in the tomes of the fathers of the first four centuries. But, secondly, unless I greatly mistake, this doctrine of the election of individuals is distinctly recognized in several of the

¹ Strom. VI. 13, 14. p. 300.

² Proph. Eclog. 57. as given by Guer. II. p. 164 sq.

passages above quoted. If so, we have then the positive authority of one of the earliest and greatest of the fathers, in support of its primitive reception in the church. When pressed by his adversaries for human authority in support of his doctrine, Augustine, according to Faber,¹ did not plead that much of it was to be found in the preceding fathers; but he urged as a reason of this, that the doctrine, instead of having never been held, had never been disputed. In exact accordance with this position of Augustine, are the above notices from the pen of Clement. In none of them does he speak of the doctrine as though it were a matter of dispute, but just as he would speak of a tenet of general belief.

It would be too much aside from my present business to consider whether other ancient fathers held to the same doctrine. Augustine refers to one or two, though of later date than Clement. Nor can I stay minutely to examine these passages above quoted, as the object of this essay is not controversial. But what construction can be put upon them that does not imply 'an election of individuals to salvation according to the foreknowledge of God,' I am unable to perceive. Clement very clearly held to a *general* election to the privileges of the gospel; and he seems, at the same time, just as plainly to have held to a more restricted and *personal* election to eternal life—an election within an election; the spiritual, in distinction from the visible and nominal Israel.—If, then, such be admitted as the fact, it will remain for the opponents of Augustine no longer to claim the unbroken authority of the early fathers, (whatever it may be worth,) but to produce, if possible, a single passage in which they *deny* the doctrine. I will not say that this cannot be done; but I have seen no such passage. It would, indeed, be easy to refer to many passages even in these Alexandrian writers, in which they totally discard the doctrine of such a fatal necessity as some think to be implied in personal election. But a discarding of the doctrine of fate, no more, implies a rejection of the doctrine of predestination by the ancients, than by moderns.

One further question needs a more decisive answer than has yet been given. Did Clement believe in the *eternal* punishment of any of our race? From the general strain of his writings on the subject of purgatory, and on the *justice of that condemnation* which awaits all who *reject the offer of salvation*,

¹ Fab. Apost. Trin. Dedication, p. 9 sq.

whether in this world or the next, we should readily infer such a belief. He very frequently implies, that some will thus reject it, both here and there.

Let us now see if there is any thing which implies that they will not continue forever to reject, and forever to suffer. The following passages are perhaps the strongest that can be adduced from his writings, in support of such a position. "But he [God] is by no means the cause of evil, for all things are arranged by the Lord of all, for the salvation of the whole, both in general and in particular. The office, therefore, of salutary justice, is to lead each one continually to the better, so far as it is practicable; for all smaller things, according to their habits, are arranged for the preservation and continuance of what is best. Thus what is virtuous changes for the better, possessing the cause of change, the choice of knowledge, which sovereign quality the soul possesses. But necessary chastisements, in the goodness of the great, all-inspecting Judge, and by attendant angels, and by diverse previous judgments, and by the final judgment, compel those having, patiently suffered the longer, to repent, *τοὺς ἐπὶ πλέον ἀπηλγηκotas ἐκβιάζονται μετανοεῖν*. But as to the remainder, I am silent, glorifying God."¹

It is not very easy to decide on the import of this singular passage, as it respects the question of universal salvation. And indeed, by the last sentence, it is manifest that the writer did not consider himself as having spoken out fully; nor was he then prepared to; but why he was not prepared, we do not learn. The following is more explicit, but perhaps less authentic. I give it as quoted by Guerike, not being able to find it in the edition of Clement's works now before me. "The Lord indeed saves all [angels and men], converting some by punishments, but others while following by their own free will, and with the dignity of honour."²

On the other hand, in a fragment of a work on the soul, quoted by Potter, Clement says, that "all souls are immortal, even those of the ungodly, for whom it were better if they were not indestructible, as they are punished by the eternal vengeance of unquenchable fire, and die not, and have no end of their torments." The authority, however, of such a fragment, may not be equal to that of passages found in his entire compositions.

¹ Strom. VII. 2. p. 394.

² Adumbr. in 1 Joh. II. 2. Guer. II. p. 165.

On the whole, we are left to say, that he has not been very explicit in the works that have come down to us, as to his belief in the eternity of future suffering. The general bearing of his language respecting the future state, is in favour of such a doctrine. Why he was not more explicit, we cannot certainly decide. Possibly he had doubts in his own mind;—or perhaps he deemed the doctrine too harsh for those whom he would allure to his instruction, and therefore he chose to be silent on the final condition of such as would never be reformed.

Origen. As to the future and eternal existence of the soul, Origen was sufficiently decided. He also held to the resurrection of the body; and to an intermediate state between death and the resurrection. Upon this intermediate state, his speculations, as we might well suppose from the cast of his mind, are numerous, and some of them sufficiently fanciful. The eleventh chapter of his second book on Principles, is devoted to this subject. From this and other portions of his works, I will endeavour to give an outline of his views. But before proceeding to them, I would just observe, that we must give him the credit of rejecting the still wilder speculations of Pythagoras and others who held to the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. This doctrine, he held in great abhorrence, and took frequent occasions to refute it, as appears from his most accredited works.

Immediately on leaving the body, Origen supposes the soul to assume a *figure* in a measure similar to that of the gross and earthly body; and to enter forthwith on a state of partial retribution. The saints, especially, he thinks do not at once receive their full reward, which he argues from Heb. xi. 39. The prophets and patriarchs, who lived before the time of Christ, went to the infernal regions at death, there to await the advent of the Redeemer, as their conductor to paradise; but to the truly pious since that period, is granted the privilege of an immediate admission to that place of blessedness.

But where and what is this paradise? It is a place, as Origen would have us believe, somewhere in the earth, in which the saints are gathered as in a “school of souls,” and where they are taught respecting the *rationale* of all things they had before seen on earth; and where they also receive some obscure views of a still further state, to which they are to be advanced, just as in this life, they had seen, as through a glass darkly, the objects they now behold in paradise. Those who are of a pure heart, and make the most rapid progress in paradise, are soonest trans-

ferred to those aerial regions, the "many mansions," which the scriptures denominate *heavens*, but which the Greeks called *spheres*. In those heavens, as the happy spirit passes through them in succession, he learns in the first the things which are there exhibited in each; and then, the reasons of those things. Thus it is, that the soul follows Jesus who has passed into the heavens, while making its way to be with him where he is, to behold his unveiled glory, face to face.

As there will be so much to learn, Origen very naturally supposes it will occupy much time for a soul to pass through these heavens; and some will be much longer in passing, than others, according to their perspicacity and the improvement they here make in the present life.

As to the things to be learnt, in this intermediate state, Origen is somewhat particular, and gives us such a list as we might well expect from such a philosopher. The mind, burning with an ineffable desire to know the reasons of things, will first enjoy an explanation of all it beheld on earth—the natures of trees, plants, animals, men,—the reasons of all the minute dispensations of providence, even to the falling of a sparrow, no one of which is fortuitous, or without a specific design,—the precise objects of all the Levitical rites and precepts,—the state of fallen angels, the cause of moral evil and deception,—and especially the work of God in man's salvation,—the nature of the operations of the Divine Spirit on the heart, etc. In the present life, we see only the visible objects of nature, and learn the *facts* in divine providence, and gain some obscure and general views, just as the painter first sketches his rude outline. But in the next state, the picture will be filled up, and the colouring will be added.

Passing from paradise into the aerial regions, the soul will find itself among the stars; and there it will have the delight, (a great one indeed to Origen,) to learn whether those distant luminaries are in fact *animated* bodies, or what they are; why each one is placed just where it is, and is of just its actual size; how, if it had been otherwise, the whole universe would have been deranged, etc.

After having thus learnt, first the facts, and then the reasons, of all visible objects, the soul is to pass to those which are invisible, of which we now know nothing, or of which we have only heard the names.

All this is for those happy spirits who love knowledge and vir-

tue. As to those who are fond of earthly things, weighed down by sordid or sensual propensities, they cannot rise ; but remain, hovering around the places they love, as wretched spectres, to haunt occasionally the living.

Thus both the good and the bad are to pass their intermediate state between death and the resurrection. Origen knew of no purgatory for the good, as it would plainly seem from his undoubted writings ; though some passages of questionable authority, have been adduced to fix the doctrine upon him.

In the resurrection, for which he strenuously argued, Origen believed that our bodies will be essentially the same as to figure, though much improved, and of a spiritual cast. In answer to objections then brought, he contends, that it is not needful to suppose we shall have precisely the same particles of matter which here compose our bodies ; for even in this life, the same body does not contain the same particles for so much as two days ; and we may even call a river the same body, though its waters are continually passing.

He thinks, as it respects the fundamental reason of an identical resurrection, that the same body which shared in the conflicts of the righteous, ought to wear the crown ; and the same which partook of the pleasures of sin, ought to suffer in the eternal flames of the ungodly. He moreover supposes, that the bodies of the just will be vastly superior to the black and miserable, yet indestructible bodies with which the wicked will be clad. Probably he was in advance of most men in his day, in the elevation of his views respecting the future state, at least as it respects the bodies of the saints ; for we find him arguing against those who contended, that we shall dwell here on this earth, in bodies and in a condition so much like the present, that we shall need food and drink, have children, live in cities walled with precious stones, have the wicked to serve us as labourers, and shall ourselves act as rulers of diverse degrees and living in great earthly splendour.

In contending against Celsus, who says that the hope of the Christians is worthy of worms, Origen does not content himself with the common saying of his day, viz. that nothing is impossible to God ; but he maintains, that there is an energy, a *seed*, in the body, which springs up like other seeds, and is itself fitted to produce the glorious body. Of course, there is not really that corruption of the future and immortal body, which the scoffer derides. The process is a natural one ; and it is not the cor-

rupted body, devoured by worms, that is to rise as the glorious habitation of the soul.

At the end of the world, the general judgment will take place. This, however, will not require a long course of time, although every secret thing is to be brought into judgment. On the contrary, Origen supposes, it will be like the resurrection itself, in a moment, in a twinkling of the eye. And this supposition is based on the assumption, that the thing which Christ, the omniscient judge, will then do, is merely to cause each individual at once to see the whole of his own past existence, and consequently to feel the justice of the final award. This may require no such length of time as would the complete exhibition of the minute facts in each case, to the whole universe, according to the more general views of Christians at the present day. Origen, as we have already seen, would probably anticipate the object of such a publication, in a great measure, by his supposed paradise.

The world is then to be burned ; but not, however, to be consumed. According to the opinion of some respectable Grecian philosophers, with which Origen agrees, and according to which he interprets some passages of Scripture, the world is only to be purified by a fire which is to burn up its bad qualities ; and thus the universe is to be renovated. This fire is also to purify the saints, burning up the wood, hay, and stubble of their spiritual building, and purging away the lead, so that nothing but pure gold shall remain. He supposes that none can rise from the dead perfectly pure, but all will need more or less of purgation ; and even such distinguished individuals as Paul and Peter, will have to pass through fire. And this fire, while it purifies, may also possibly serve as a punishment ; or, at all events, the language employed by God, in describing it, is designed as a motive of terror to the ignorant and stupid of this life.

After this, each one of the righteous will have his blessed allotment according to his deeds. There will be different degrees of happiness ; and by no means will all ascend immediately to heaven. While some are to be directly subject to Christ, others will be put under the supervision of angels, and will have many mansions or heavens to pass through, before they come to the beatific vision of the Father. But when they finally arrive at this highest state, they will there find their eternal felicity ; all will be spiritual enjoyment and spiritual occupation forever.

They will see God as he is—Christ as he is—and will drink at the exhaustless fountain of knowledge and wisdom.

Such is an outline of the views of Origen respecting the pious. We come now to inquire in respect to that other class, which the Scriptures denominate *the wicked*.

In the opinion of this father, the condition of the ungodly, between death and the resurrection, will be radically diverse from that of the righteous, in as much as they will be thrust into the fires of purgatory, the place prepared for the devil and his angels. But though there will be one and the same kind of punishment for all, both devils and wicked men, yet the degrees of suffering will differ in proportion to the degrees of guilt. Yet the agony of each one, will be terrible. Origen does not, however, seem to have conceived of a literal fire, in this case; for he says, that each one will kindle the flame of his appropriate fire, instead of being plunged in a fire already prepared by another. The materials to sustain this fire, are our sins; and the fire perhaps such, that while itself is invisible, it can burn things that are invisible. Like a fever raging in the body, the fresh remembrance of all past guilt, will prey upon the soul. Conscience will pierce with its appropriate stings. The soul will also be tormented with vile affections, anger, rage, and madness, love, grief, envy, etc. Nor will the deadly poison of these vile and inordinate affections, be assuaged by any of the alleviations we here find. The soul will also dwell in darkness, and be deprived of the divine spirit and of its guardian angel. And just as the naked body may here suffer more severely beneath the lash, so may the naked soul from its passions in the place of torment.

After the resurrection, Origen thinks the wicked may have dark and vile bodies, in contrast to those of the children of God.

As to the *duration* of their woe, he supposes, that as a wound which is here inflicted on the body in a moment, may require many months in healing, so the diseases contracted by a short course of sinful pleasure, may entail, on the guilty man, an eternity of suffering, in that place where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched. He does not hesitate at all to speak, in his common addresses, of the torments of the wicked as being eternal. Indeed it seems to be his design, as he likewise supposes it to be the design of the Scriptures, to take away all hope from those who in this life contemn God. But in his more philosophical discourses, he abundantly shows, that he does not assign a literal eternity of duration to the torments of the wicked.

He considered God as punishing the wicked, both men and devils, for the purpose of recovering them from sin, and thus doing away all moral evil ; and with it also, all natural evil. In the tenth chapter of his second book on Principles, which he devotes to the discussion of the future state of the wicked, Origen tells us, that ' God acts as the Physician of our souls, in assigning the torments of the infernal world ; and that his purpose is, to remove all the vices from the wicked which they have contracted by sin,' etc. And in the sixth chapter of the first book, he speaks still more at large on this subject. It is due to him, however, and to the cause of truth to state, that he here expressly admonishes the reader, before entering on the lofty subjects of the final consummation of God's great plan, that he is, with great fear and caution, about to propose some things rather for discussion and consideration, than for doctrines which he would propound as definite and certain. And he furthermore craves the candour of his reader, that he would not regard what he is about to offer, as amounting to a heretical departure from the received faith of the church. Such a statement and such a request seem to amount to a pretty full concession, that what he was about to propound, would be regarded as heresy by the church in his day, if he were to *assert* such things, instead of modestly propounding them for discussion. Such a concession is, of course, worth more to the cause of dogmatic history, than can be the most minute knowledge of what Origen himself or any other single individual then believed. It may also be remarked, that such a statement as this made near the beginning of his work on Principles, was doubtless intended to show the manner in which he would be understood throughout the whole work, when advancing the same sentiments ; and so too in his other works. We are therefore, not to understand him as being so fixed and decided in his views of a future and perfect restoration of our race to virtue and happiness, as the mere language of many insulated passages, would seem to imply. He is rather arguing one side of 'the question he propounds,' and saying what seems to him as *probably* true.

After thus limiting the manner in which he desires to be understood, he goes on to say, that " there will be an end of the world and a consummation of all things, when every one will be subjected to punishment according to the desert of his sins. God only knows the time when each will accomplish what he deserves. We suppose the goodness of God, through

Christ, will truly restore his universal creation to one end, even his enemies being subdued and made subjects. For so saith the Holy Scripture : The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool. And if it is not sufficiently manifest to us, what the prophetic Word would indicate by this, we may learn more fully from the apostle Paul, who says that it becomes Christ to reign till he hath put all things under his feet. But if this so plain an expression of the apostle does not sufficiently teach us what it is for enemies to be put under his feet, hear him yet further in the following : "For it is fit that all things should be made subject unto him." What, then, is the subjection in which all things should be subject? I think it is the very same in which we also desire to be subject to him, and in which the apostles and all the holy, who have followed Christ, are subject to him. For the name of the subjection by which we are subject to Christ, is indicative of the salvation of the subjects, a salvation which is from Christ; just as David also says : "Shall not my soul be subject to God? for from him is my salvation." Origen goes on to argue further respecting this "end," when Christ, to whom all things are thus made subject, shall deliver the kingdom to the Father; and he contends that this end will be like the beginning. Indeed, he affirms, that "the end is always like the beginning;" and thus, as all were holy and happy at first, so they will be at the last; all in heaven and on earth and under the earth, in which three designations the whole universe is included, shall bow the knee to Christ, and come in the unity of the Spirit, and thus all will be in accordance, and God will be all in all.

Those who are under the dominion of the devil, according to Origen, whether in this or in the future world, as they enjoy the power of freewill, may repent and turn to God. But it will be at an immensely distant period, before all of them will do this—ages upon ages, as it were eternal. Nor will they at once ascend to God, when they have passed through the scenes of positive misery, but will go through the gradations of ascent, from mansion to mansion, like the saints before them. God, he thinks, is able and disposed to accomplish all this in its proper time. Writing against Celsus, he says : "The Word is able to subdue all rational natures to himself, and to transform them into his own perfection; when each one, using his own naked power, will choose what he wills and obtain what he chooses. For

though among the wounds and diseases of the body, there are those which no medical art can cure; yet in the vices of the soul, we deny that there is any which cannot be cured by the supreme Word and God." When this is done, there will be no more death, nor pains of death, nor devil, nor evil being, nor evil thing. Men, and devils, and stars, and other fallen beings, if such there be, will all be brought back to perfect allegiance and perfect bliss and unity of feeling.

This view of a complete restoration, is one in which his mind seemed peculiarly to delight. It would be easy to add many more passages scattered through his works, and some of them partaking much of the sublime, in which he dwells on this idea of God's becoming all in all. But enough has probably been adduced to give a fair view of his scheme and his mode of proof. As it respects, however, this perfect unity throughout the whole range of existences, God all in all, it is by no means easy to comprehend precisely what he would mean, as he seems to be aiming at something more than a mere unity of feeling, purpose, action, and enjoyment, and yet not quite at the eastern notion of an absorption of all into God, from whom they first originated.

But whatever we may think of his speculations, there are two things which the candid student of the works of this great man, will readily acknowledge of him here as elsewhere, viz. that he is kind and modest in his manner, and that he deals much in Scripture proofs, for which he even shows the profoundest reverence, however strangely he interprets them. And it is with perfect propriety that Guerike remarks of him, that he joins the modesty of a Christian with the audacity of a philosopher.¹

Dionysius.—We find but little from this author on the subject of *eschatology*, as it is sometimes called, or the final state of man. And this little has reference to the position then maintained by the *chiliasm*. They supposed, that Christ would descend from heaven and reign on earth, for a thousand years, or perhaps for many thousands, after the destruction of Antichrist; and that the saints would be raised and would reign with him. Origen opposed this notion, as is evident from what we have already seen. Dionysius followed his steps; and as appears from

¹ For the authorities on which the above statements are made, see *Con. Cels.* IV. 21. V. 14—20. VIII. 72. *De Princ.* II. 10, 1—8. and 11, 1—7. I. 6, 3, and other references in *Guer.* II. p. 260 sq.

his own account, quoted by Eusebius,¹ he was very successful in reclaiming whole churches in the province of Arsinoë, and of convincing Coracius their chief leader in this schism. They founded their belief chiefly on a false interpretation of some passages in the Apocalypse; but Dionysius, instead of rectifying their exegesis, rejected the authority of the whole book.

We pass over the teachers between Dionysius and Didymus, as affording nothing to our present purpose in the writings they have left us.

Didymus.—This catechist also opposed the chiliasts, who were still found in considerable numbers; and who, indeed, though with modified views, have been found probably in every age down to the present.

After the death of the body, Didymus supposes the souls of believers to be conveyed to Abraham's bosom, which he understands to be some lofty and ethereal region. This is surely a great improvement from the notions of his admired Origen. When there, however, he supposes them to intercede for those still left on the earth.

He believed in a resurrection of the body; but that it would be a spiritual body, in distinction from its present grossness.

As to the time of the resurrection, he supposed that Antichrist must first appear upon earth in a season of great distress, and that the period was then nigh.

Following the resurrection, is to be the last judgment, which Didymus concludes will be conducted by Christ and the Father in conjunction. The inheritance of the blessed is then to be assigned, and they are to reign with Christ forever. Still they are not to be *kings*, but are to exist and reign in a kind of union with Christ and the Father.

In respect to the *wicked*, he speaks of their being consigned to "the quenchless fire of hell," and as "having to endure everlasting torment," and "being led away into eternal death," and "having no more repentance." And yet, on the other hand, he seemed to hope for the repentance of fallen angels; and as Guerike thinks, did not entirely despair of the final salvation of lost men, "after an eternal period."²

¹ Euseb. Ecc. Hist. VII. 24.

² De Trin. I. 29. II. 3. 7. 12. 27. III. 29. Guer. II. p. 378 sq.

Thus have we taken some view of the lives and doctrines of those fathers who, for more than two centuries, presided over the first and principal school of clerical instruction, in those deeply interesting and forming ages of the church. The amount of influence they exerted, and which still exists in its countless ramifications throughout Christendom, it is impossible to estimate. We might dwell on many other topics of doctrine, practice, and mode of interpreting the sacred oracles, were it worth while to prolong this article further.

It would doubtless be interesting and profitable, to continue the investigation of clerical education down through the succeeding ages, were the materials equally at hand.—But I must close, at least for the present, with the brief remark, that the more familiar we become with the state of the church in past ages, especially with the doctrines that have been held, the more deeply shall we be impressed with the reflection, that neither wisdom nor folly has been born in our day.

ART. II.—THE KARAITES, AND OTHER JEWISH SECTS.

From Henderson's Travels in Russia.*

The most popular sect among the Jews, is that known by the name of *Rabbinists*, or *Talmudists*, i. e. such as yield implicit obedience to the doctrines and institutions of the Rabbins, as delivered in, or deducible from the Talmud, and who, according to the general acceptation of the term, may be accounted the orthodox. They are also sometimes called *Baalê Mishna*,

* "Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia. By E. Henderson, [now Prof. of Divinity etc. in Highbury College,] London 1826." p. 233 sq. 306 sq. As this work has never been reprinted in America, we have thought it worth the while to transfer the following interesting account to our pages.—The chief source of earlier information respecting the Karaites, is the work of Wolf. viz. J. C. WOLFII *Notitia Karaeorum*, Hamb. 1721, to which is appended Trigland's tract, J. TRIGLANDII *Diatribe de Secta Karaeorum*.—EDITOR.

or possessors of the Mishna, because its decisions obtain among them, as the sole and infallible interpretation of the law. They are precisely, in the present day, what the Pharisees were in the time of our Lord; and it requires but little acquaintance with them, to be sensible of those features of character which are so strongly marked by the Evangelists, as distinguishing that ancient sect. But, although the Rabbinites compose the great body of the Jews in Poland, there exist other denominations, the numbers and peculiarities of which are too considerable not to strike the inquisitive traveller.

These are the *Karnites*, the *Chasidim*, and the *Zoharites*, or followers of Sabbathai Tzevi.

The *Chasidim*, or "Pietists," must not be confounded with the party who took the same name at the time of the Maccabees, and rendered themselves famous by the zeal with which they contended for the national institutions. The sect to which I here refer, dates its origin no farther back than the year 1740, when its doctrines were first broached by Israel Baalshem, in the small country town of Flussty, in Poland. In the course of about twenty years, his fame, as an exorcist, and master of the Cabala, spread to such a degree, that he obtained a great number of followers in Poland, Moldavia, and Wallachia. This Rabbi gave out, that he alone was possessed of the true mystery of the Sacred name; that his soul at certain times left the body, in order to receive revelations in the world of spirits; and, that he was endowed with miraculous powers by which he was able to control events, both in the physical and intellectual world. His followers were taught to look to him for the absolution of every crime they might commit; to repress every thing like reflection on the doctrines of religion; to expect the immediate appearance of the Messiah; and in sickness, to abstain from the use of medicine—assured, that their spiritual guides, of whom several made their appearance on the death of the founder, were possessed of such merits, as would procure for them instant recovery. The accusations of gross immorality brought against the members of this sect by the Lithuanian Rabbi, Israel Loebel, have been called in question,¹ and are supposed rather to have originated in prejudice, than to have any foundation in truth; but I have been informed by one, who has had the best opportunities of investigating the subject, that their morals are most obnoxious, and

¹ Gregoire's *Histoire des Sectes Religieuses*, tom ii. p. 348.

that the representations that have been given of them are by no means exaggerated. They are not only at enmity with all the other Jews, but form the bitterest and most bigotted enemies of the christian religion. They believe, that the Messiah, whom they are hourly expecting, will be a mere man, but will come with such an effulgence of glory, as to produce a complete regeneration in the heart of every Jew, and deliver them thenceforth from every evil. To their Rabbins, whom they honour with the name of *Zadiks*, or "Righteous," they pay almost divine homage. The extravagance of their gestures during their public service, entitles them to the appellation of the "Jewish Jumpers." Working themselves up into ecstasies, they break out into fits of laughter, clap their hands, jump up and down in the synagogue in the most frantic manner; and turning their faces towards heaven, they clench their fists, and, as it were, dare the Almighty to withhold from them the objects of their requests. This sect has so increased of late years, that in Russian Poland and European Turkey, it is reported to exceed in number that of the Rabbinites in these parts.

Of this sect there exists a subdivision founded by Rabbi Solomon, in the government of Mohilef. They are distinguished by the name of *Habadim*, a word composed of the initial letters of three Hebrew words, חכמה בינה דעת, "wisdom, intelligence, and knowledge." They may not improperly be termed the "Jewish Quietists," as their distinguishing peculiarity consists in the rejection of external forms, and the complete abandonment of the mind to abstraction and contemplation. Instead of the distinctions customary among the Jews, they go through the signs without the use of the element, and consider it their duty to disengage themselves as much as possible from matter, because of its tendency to clog the mind in its ascent to the Supreme Source of Intelligence. In prayer they make no use of words, but simply place themselves in the attitude of supplication, and exercise themselves in mental ejaculations.

The *Zoharites*, so called from their attachment to the book *Zohar*, are properly to be regarded as a continuation of the sect formed by the famous Sabbathai Tzevi. Their creed is briefly as follows: 1. They believe in all that God has ever revealed, and consider it their duty constantly to investigate its meaning. 2. They regard the letter of Scripture to be merely the shell, and that it admits of a mystical and spiritual interpretation. 3. They believe in a Trinity of *Parzufim*, or persons in *Elohim*.

4. They believe in the incarnation of God ; that this incarnation took place in Adam, and that it will again take place in the Messiah. 5. They do not believe that Jerusalem will ever be re-built. 6. They believe that it is vain to expect any temporal Messiah ; but that God will be manifested in the flesh, and in this state alone, not only for the sins of the Jews, but for the sins of all throughout the world who believe in him.

This sect was revived about the year 1750, by a Polish Jew, of the name of Jacob Frank, who settled in Podolia, and enjoyed the protection of the Polish government, to which he was recommended by the Bishop of Kamenetz, in whose presence he held disputes with the orthodox Jews, and who was astonished at the approximation of his creed to the principles of Christianity. On the death of the Bishop, he and his adherents were driven into the Turkish dominions ; and being also persecuted there by the Rabbinites, they resolved to conform to the rites of the catholic Church. Frank at last found a place of rest at Offenbach, whither his followers flocked by thousands to visit him, and where he died in 1791. Their number does not appear to have increased much of late ; but they are to be met with in different parts of Hungary and Poland.

THE KARAITES.

An object of no ordinary interest which we hoped to attain by our visit to the Crimea, and which we had long regarded with pleasing anticipations, was a personal interview with the Karaite Jews inhabiting an ancient fortress at the distance of a few versts from *Baghtchisarai*. The antiquity of the sect, the reasonableness of their grounds of separation from the great body of the Jewish people, their purely oriental habits, the little intercourse that any of the learned in Europe have had with them, and the fact, long known yet but little investigated, that they possessed the books of the Old Testament in a peculiar dialect of the Tartar language :—all tended to excite our curiosity, and render them the subject of Biblical and literary research.

Accordingly, the day after our arrival in *Baghtchisarai*, we proceeded in company with the Rev. Messrs. Glen and Ross, towards *Djufut-Kaldè*, or the Jews' Fort, the road to which led us further up the deep and narrow valley in which the ancient capital of the Crimea is situated. The rocks on our left were high and precipitous, and often projected over-head, exhibiting

large excavations and grottoes, many of which seemed to be used by the Tartars, partly for residence and partly for sheltering their cattle. Our ride through the upper end of the town, among mesjeds, medresses, minarets, and majestic poplars, was singularly picturesque and interesting. Near the site of a palace, in the valley called *Ashlama-derè*, that was razed to the foundations on the fall of the Tartar empire, we turned to the west, and entered another narrow defile, known by the name of *Mariam-derè*, or Mary's Vale, from a Greek convent dedicated to the Virgin, which has been curiously excavated in the precipice on the right, and looks like a large covered balcony at the height of several hundred feet from the valley below. Leaving our horses to graze on the verdant bank of the rivulet, we ascended to the monastery by a narrow flight of steps; and, on reaching the entrance in "the crag of the rock," the view of the precipice over which we were suspended was so tremendous, that we instantly receded with sensations of awe. The church measured fifty feet in length by twenty-four in breadth, yet small as were its dimensions, its darkness was but dimly enlightened by a lamp hanging before a painting at the inner end. All was sombre and silent, and with the exception of a single religious solitary, we saw nothing to remind us of the world of mortals. We were informed, however, that scarcely a day elapses on which the convent is not visited for purposes of devotion; and on the day of the ascension of the Virgin, numbers of visitors to the amount of several thousands, collect from all parts of the Crimea, and even from the Russian districts beyond Perekop. As only a few can be admitted at once, the passage of steps communicating between the valley and the monastery, presents a curious scene of ascent and descent, while both sides of the rivulet are diversified by small groups, renewing their old acquaintances, or contracting new ones.

Directly below, on the opposite side of the defile, we observed extensive ruins, marking the site of a town formerly inhabited by Greeks, but laid desolate on the subjugation of the Tartars. From this romantic spot we prosecuted our ride, and passing two beautiful fountains, to which the Jewish damsels, like Rebekah and Rachel of old, "come out to draw water,"¹ we reached the foot of the precipice, on the summit of which *Dju-*

¹ The general supply of water is conveyed on the backs of horses or mules.

fort-Kalé is situated. The road now became excessively steep; and, as it forms a complete zig-zag, we were surprised to find, that when we supposed ourselves near the entrance of the fort, the pathway appeared all at once to be terminated by a rugged and inaccessible rock. We were the more disconcerted at this discovery, as a thunder-storm had just commenced, and the rain began to pour down with violence; but on turning another angle, we came to several caverns in the side of the precipice, where we found a temporary shelter, and from which we contemplated the flashes of the lightning, and listened to the awfully reverberating roar of the thunder in the valley below.

When the storm was over, we again commenced our ascent, and soon came to the gate of this ancient fortress, through which we were admitted into a narrow street running from one end of the town to the other. The houses are all constructed in the oriental style, with the windows looking into the courts, and are surrounded by a high stone wall. Besides the defence formed by these walls, rising perpendicularly from the brink of the precipices on either side, a regular fortified wall has been raised to protect such places as had not been rendered strong by nature. The streets had been washed by the rain which was running down in torrents, but we walked on a fine broad pavement leading to the principal synagogue, where we met the chief Rabbi, a venerable old man of the name of Isaac, by whom we were received with great courtesy, and conducted to the residence of Rabbi Benjamin, which appeared to be the house destined for the reception of strangers.

On entering the guest chamber, or "upper-room," which was beautifully covered with carpets, we were obliged to pull off our boots, and recline in the oriental fashion, on bolsters, which were placed round the sides of the room. While engaged in a friendly interchange of questions and answers with our host, a large tray was placed on the floor in the middle of the room, covered with bread, butter, dates, pears, mulberries, brandy, and wine, of which we were invited to partake at pleasure. The conversation was carried on in Turkish and Hebrew; and the Rabbins seemed no less anxious to satisfy our curiosity, than we were to obtain information respecting the history and distinguishing peculiarities of the Karaim. In Benjamin's library, besides the Talmud, and a considerable collection of other Hebrew books, we found a good copy of Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible. Besides the Tartar Targum, of which more presently, he showed

us several Karaite commentaries in Hebrew, and assured us that they had them on the whole Bible; but that entire copies were very scarce, and high in price. A commentary on the Pentateuch alone costs 150 rubles, or about £6 sterling.

From the house of the Rabbi we proceeded to the synagogues, which are two in number, a larger and a smaller, the former of which is elegantly fitted up, and is ornamented in the inside with a large stone monument, erected on the accession of the emperor Alexander to the throne. The inscription contains some beautiful laudatory lines in the Hebrew language. From the Ark of the Covenant, several elegant, and one or two apparently very ancient MSS. of the law, in rolls of parchment, were brought out, and exhibited to us, some of which had been written on the spot, and the rest brought from Constantinople and Poland. The body of the synagogue was filled with reading desks, on each of which lay Hebrew Bibles, prayer-books, and parts of the Targum. The Bibles were chiefly of the Venetian editions, such as are mostly in request among the Spanish Jews in Constantinople, whence they have been conveyed to the Crimea.

The number of families resident in Djufut-Kalè, amounts to about *two-hundred and fifty*, many of the members of which are absent during certain seasons of the year, transacting business in Odessa, and other towns in Russia and Poland. Others of them regularly repair every morning to Baghtchisaraï, where they have shops, and return to the castle in the evening.

Passing through the southern gate, we ascended a small eminence, from which we had a commanding view, not only of this "munition of rocks," but of the romantic scenery by which it is surrounded. Towards the east the Tent mountain (*Tchatir-dagh*), rose majestically above the intervening chains of rugged and precipitous rocks, and almost directly south, we caught a distant prospect of the fortress of *Mankup*. This ancient castle, once in possession of the Genoese, is now in ruins; but it was inhabited till within these few years by Tartars and Karaites. Being situated on the summit of a high insulated rock, it is almost inaccessible, and presents a singularly prominent object in the perspective. *Djufut-Kalè* itself, we now found to be constructed on the summit of the narrowest part of a high ridge of rocks, which here projects towards the north, and terminates abruptly on meeting the valley of Ashlama, above Baghtchisaraï. The strength of this place is mostly from nature, the rocks rising

perpendicularly on either side, and the ridge, not being of any breadth, it required little labour to fortify the town at its southern termination. The continuation of the ridge is covered with grass, and used to afford pasture to a fine herd of deer; but we were informed by the Jew who conducted us, that their number is now reduced to *three*.

We now descended into the "Valley of Jehobhabbat," or the Karaite burying-ground, consisting of a deep recess, covered with lofty trees, to the sombre shade of which, the white slabs placed over the graves of the deceased, presented the most interesting contrast. A pleasing melancholy seized our minds as we entered this hollowed spot; and were it not for the distressing idea of the obstinate unbelief of Judaism, associated with the general amiability of the Karaite character, it is scarcely possible to conceive any scene more calculated to soothe the mind of a contemplative spectator. The tomb-stones, mostly of white marble, are regularly arranged in rows, somewhat after the manner of the Moravian graves; and the more modern have an additional monument at either end, consisting likewise of a marble slab, some with and some without Hebrew inscriptions. Being anxious, if possible, to discover from these monumental annals, how far back the residence of the Jews in Djusut-Kalé could be traced, we requested our guide to point out to us the oldest grave, which he readily did, assuring us that it was held in great veneration by his brethren. It consists of a plain slab, which has been partially fractured on the surface; but, on clearing away the moss which had filled up the incisions of the letters, the following inscription was brought out:

שמע
קבורה געז
יוסף בן דוד
בשנת חמש
אלפים ור
ת

The reader will observe, that the last letter in the first line has been considerably effaced, but to judge from its present appearance, it must have been a *Mem*. The rest of the letters שמע, I take to form the initial word of the sacred motto of the Jews, שמע ישראל, "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah." Deut. vi. 4. This inscription is also defective at

the close, something having been effaced after the Daleth, which the sculptor, not versed in the laws of Masoretic caligraphy, has divided, and placed the plural feminine termination at the beginning of the following line. The word has, most probably, been the poetical form שְׁנוּרָה; so that the whole inscription will read thus: "*Hear, O Israel, etc. The Grave of Geez, Joseph Ben David. In the year Five thousand and four.*" That is, according to the Christian era, the year 1364, an epoch somewhat more than a century later than the commencement of the Tartar dynasty in the Crimea.

The *Karaim* have no written document to prove at what time they first occupied this fort, or develop the circumstances which originated or attended their immigration into the peninsula. Peysonel, in his work on the Commerce of the Black Sea, states that a tradition obtained among them, purporting that their ancestors inhabited the city of Bukhara in Great Tartary, and that they accompanied the Tartars in their memorable expedition into Europe. The circumstance that the Karaites dress much in the Tartar style, and speak a dialect to which they give the name of *Djagaltai*, might seem to give some weight to this account; but no such tradition is known to the present generation, and their conformity to the Tartars in language and habits is easily accounted for, by the length of time they have lived under their dominion. In consequence of inquiries made on the spot, as well as subsequent epistolary communications, it appears that they have no recollection of any bond of union ever having existed between their ancestors and the Bukharian Jews; that, as far as their knowledge extends, there exist no Karaim in that quarter; and the only traditionary account current among them is, that their ancestors came from *Damascus*, and settled here about 500 years ago, under the protection of the Khans of the Crimea. Their language, too, as exhibited in their ancient books, approximates much more to the *Osmanli*, than to the Oriental Turkish.¹

About the beginning of last century, in the reign of the Khan Hadji Selim Gherei, they had peculiar privileges conferred on them, in consequence of a successful cure performed by one of their physicians on Ulu Khani, a sister of the Khan, who was

¹ It appears, from the Travels of Rabbi Petachia, that there were Karaites in the Crimea about the year 1180, which was considerably prior to the arrival of the Tartars.

dangerously ill. Instead of any longer performing certain drudgery-work at the palace, and paying a heavy capitation-tax, in common with their neighbours, the Greeks and Armenians, they were taken under the protection of the princesses of the above rank, and only supplied their establishment with wood, coffee, and other articles of domestic use, which they furnished not so much by way of tribute, but as a token of gratitude for the immunities that were granted them.

With respect to the sect in general, it claims a very high antiquity, and seems originally to have been the same with that of the Sadducees, one of the three principal sects which divided the Jewish nation about two hundred years before the incarnation of our Saviour. One of their distinguishing tenets is known to have been their strict adherence to the letter of the law, to the entire exclusion of traditionary interpretation; and, indeed, it has not unnaturally been conjectured by some authors of note, that the errors which that sect taught in the time of our Lord formed no part of their primitive creed, and that it was the adoption of these errors by the disciples of Sadok, that gave birth to the Karaim; whom, in common with Hottinger, Altling, Trigland, and others, Prideaux takes to be *Scribes* so frequently mentioned in the New Testament. This opinion, however, seems totally irreconcilable with Matt. xv. 1, 2, where the Scribes are represented as equally tenacious of the traditions with the Pharisees. It is not improbable that the number of the reformed party of the Sadducees was extremely small in the days of our Lord, as, in fact, that of the Karaim has comparatively been in every succeeding age. According to Mordecai, one of their own writers, they are sprung from Judah Ben Tab-bai, and were originally denominated, after him, the Society of J. B. T. but afterwards changed their name to that of *Karaim*.

But whatever obscurity may remain, as to the exact period or the particular occasion of their origin, so much is certain, that the sect was not formed by Rabbi Anan, as Morinus and others have erroneously supposed; but that it only underwent a reformation by that celebrated Rabbi, during the period of his opposition to the introduction of the Talmud as a rule of manners, and his enforcement of the paramount authority of the divine law. In proof of this, I shall quote a passage from the Karaite ritual, at the commencement of the chapter entitled זכרון, or the service in memory of the dead; in which we find Anan occupying the first place, but only as one who had effected a radical re-

formation of manners, and reduced the *Karaites* to the primitive observance of the law. The prayer begins thus:—"May our God, and the God of our fathers, have mercy on our dead, and your dead, and all the dead of all his people of the house of Israel! And, first of all, on Anan our Rabbi, the prince, the man of God, chief of the captivity, *who opened the way of the law, and enlightened the eyes of the Scripturists*, [literally, *Sons of the text*,] and turned many from iniquity and transgression, and caused us to walk in the right way."¹ The same language, with an accumulation of laudatory epithets, is used respecting him by Mordecai; and Rabbi S. Shullam, agreeably to this, declares that Anan אֲנָן אֲמִנֵת הַקְּרָאִים, "confirmed the faith of the Karaites." Jucharin, fol. cxix. col. 2. According to Makrizi,² Anan came from the east, under the caliphate of Abu Djafar Mansur, about the middle of the eighth century, and brought along with him copies of the law, professedly taken from the architypal exemplar, written by the hand of Moses. His great learning, and the favour he enjoyed with the Caliph, gave him peculiar advantages in his disputes with the Talmudists, whom he taxed with the introduction of usages contrary to those inculcated by the sacred books in his hands; and it would appear, both from the statements of Makrizi, and those of Abulfeda,³ that Anan, as well as some of his followers, spoke with the highest respect of Jesus of Nazareth, and condemned the Jews for treating him as an impostor, and putting him to death, without weighing the justice of his pretensions, and his claims of excellence and merit.

If the accounts that obtain among themselves may be credited, the first place where a Karaite synagogue was established, after the destruction of Jerusalem, was Grand Cairo, in which city they have always kept up a separate community, and where, according to most recent accounts, they still exist at the present day. The Karaite Rabbi Samuel states, in his Itinerary, that besides fourteen copies of the law, the Karaite synagogue at

¹ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ יִרְחַם אֶת מַתִּינֵינוּ וְאֶת מַתִּיכֵם וְאֶת מַתִּי כָל כָּל עַמּוֹ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרָאשׁ וּבְחֻלָּה לְרִבֵּינוּ עֵנָן הַנְּשִׂיא אִישׁ חֲאֲלָהִים רֹאשׁ הַגִּלָּה אֲשֶׁר פָּתַח אֶת דֶּרֶךְ הַתּוֹרָה יְהָאֹר עֵינֵי בְּנֵי מִקְרָא וְרַבִּים הַשֵּׁב מִעֵן וּמַעֲבָרָה וְהַדְרִיכֵנוּ בְּדֶרֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל :

² De Sacy's Chrestomathie Arabe. Vol. II. p. 176.

³ Chrest. Arabe, p. 207.

Cairo possessed a great number of books written by their wise men, in the Arabic language. In the village of Haskiöl, near Constantinople, they have long been established, and maintain that they are descendants of such Karaites as settled there in the time of Constantine the Great. When visited by Björnstaël, in 1776, their number amounted to about *two hundred*; but Dr Scholtz, who was there in 1821, states their number at 1,500. They were in possession of MSS. containing the Hebrew Text of the Five Books of Moses, with the Targum of Onkelos, written A. D. 1240. He also found among them a Tartar version,¹ in all probability a copy of that in use among the Crimean Karaites, and of which a particular account will be given at the close of this chapter; but, according to earlier accounts, the translation in common use among them is in the vernacular Greek,² and is doubtless the same that was printed in the Constantinopolitan Polyglott, in the year 1547. According to a letter addressed to Hottinger,³ by Professor Legerus of Geneva, there existed, about the year 1649, in Poland, 2,000 Karaites; in Constantinople, 70; in Theodosia, 1,200; in Cairo, 300; in Damascus, 200; in Jerusalem, 30; in Babylonia, 100; and in Persia, 600. At the present day, they are found in different parts of Russia, Poland, Lithuania, Austria, the Caucasus, Turkey, Egypt, Abyssinia, India, and the Holy Land; but their numbers have not been ascertained.

As has already been observed, the principal point of difference between them and the Rabbinists, or Pharisaical Jews, consists in their rejection of the oral law, and their rigid appeal to the text of Scripture as the exclusive and only infallible source and test of religious truth. It is on this account that they are called *Karaites*,⁴ or *Scripturists*, which name they glory in, as clearly and honourably expressive of the fundamen-

¹ Michaelis' Orient. and Exeget. Bibl. xv. pp. 92, 93.

² Tela Ign. Satanae, p. 596.

³ Thesaur. Philol. p. 583. Compare Rabbi Benjamin's Itinerary; according to which, that author found at Constantinople above 500 Karaim; at Askalon, 40; at Damascus, 200. He travelled about the middle of the twelfth century.

⁴ קראים, *Karaim*, from קרא, *Kara*, "Scripture." They are also frequently called בני מקרא, *bene mikra*, *sons of the text*, and בעלי מקרא, *baalâ-mikra*, *masters or possessors of the text*.

tal peculiarity of their creed, though, in all probability, as is the case with the epithets by which most sects and systems of opinions have been characterized, it was given them at first by their enemies. The reader will greatly err, however, if he supposes that, in their zeal for the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, the Karaites carry their enmity to the Talmud and other Jewish writings so far as never to consult them, or have them in their possession. This is by no means the case. On our visit to the principal Rabbi in *Djufut Kalè*, we found some of the ponderous volumes in his library; and the answer he gave to our expression of surprise was singularly characteristic of the moderation and good sense of the sect in general:—"We do not admit that the Talmud has any binding authority over our consciences, and there are many things in it which we cannot approve; but should we on this account reject what is good in it, and not avail ourselves of such statements as are consonant with the text of Scripture?"

Another remarkable point of disagreement between the two sects, is their different methods of interpreting Scripture. While the Talmudist chiefly applies the cabbalistical art to bring out recondite and mysterious meanings from the sacred text, the Karaite maintains that the Scripture is its own interpreter, and that the sense of a passage is to be determined by the grammatical meaning of the words, the scope and connexion, and a comparison of parallel passages.

The necessary consequence of this close attachment to the letter of the law is visible, in various ways, both in their personal conduct, and in their ritual observances. For example: it is commanded in the law of Moses, "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations on the Sabbath day," *Exod. xxxv. 3*; yet every traveller must be struck, on entering a Polish village during the night of the Jewish Sabbath, to find it completely illuminated by the profusion of candles that are burning in the houses of the Jews, all of which have been lighted a few minutes before the Sabbath commenced; and as to the keeping up of fires, every difficulty is removed by laying the emphasis on the word *thou*, concluding, that it is not unlawful for the Jews to get Christian servants to do these offices for them. In the houses of the Karaim, on the contrary, you will neither see a candle nor fire, from sunset on Friday evening till the same time the evening following. They eat nothing but cold meat during the whole of this period. The only instance of evasion on their part that I

have heard of, is their leaning over the window to light and smoke their pipes; but my information was from a Rabbiniſt, and is therefore to be ſuſpected.

The Karaim alſo ſanctify the Sabbath by rigid abſtinenſe and a cloſe application of the mind to the duties of religion. At *Dju-fut Kalè*, the gates of the fort are ſhut at ſunſet on Friday evening, and never on any occaſion, opened till ſunſet on the evening of the Sabbath, in ſtrict conformity with the ordinance Neh. xiii. 19. This was one of the privileges conceded to them by the Khans of the Crimea. The Rabbiniſts, on the contrary, in direct violation of Iſa. lviii. 13, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath—from doing thy pleaſure on my holy day," convert it into a ſeaſon of carnal delight, making it a day of feaſting, conviviality, and ſenſual enjoyment.

The *Karaim* are free from many of the ſuperſtitious, to be found among the Jews in general, ſuch as the transmigration of ſouls, the power of talismans, etc. and, as might naturally be expected from their principles, the ſtandard and tone of morals which their general deportment exhibits is quite of a different ſtamp from thoſe of the *Rabbiniſts*. In their perſons they are tidy; their domeſtic diſcipline and arrangements are correct and exemplary; and their dealings with others are characterized by probity and integrity. It is one of their favourite maxims, that "Thoſe things which a man is not willing to receive himſelf, it is not right for him to do to his brethren,"¹—a maxim literally correſponding with that which our Lord pronounces to be the ſum of what the law and prophets taught as the duty of man to man, Matt. vii. 12. How far the *Karaim* act up to this principle, may be aſcertained by the fact, that they are univerſally reſpected by all who know them; and I never heard any perſon ſpeak ill of them, except he was a bigoted adherent of the Talmud. In the ſouth of Ruſſia, where they are beſt known, their conduct is proverbial; and I cannot place it in a ſtronger light than by recording the testimony borne to it by a Poſiſh gentleman in Dubno, who informed me that, while the other Jews reſident in Luſk are continually engaged in ſuits at law, and require the utmoſt vigilance on the part of the police, there is not on record a ſingle inſtance of proſecution againſt the Ka-

¹ הענינים שלא יקבלם האדם לעצמו כן אין ראוי לעשותם לאחריו.

raim for the space of several hundred years, during which they have been seated in that place!

By the *Rabbinists* they are held in perfect abhorrence. Eisenmenger relates¹ that he was eye-witness of this in Frankfort on the Maine, where he found a *Karaite* in the Jews' street, to whom they had been kind at first, taking him to be of their own sect; but the moment they discovered that he was one of the "Sons of the Text," they hissed him out of the street with contempt. In the time of Rabbi Benjamin,² there existed a literal wall of separation between them in Constantinople; and I was struck, when visiting them at Lutsk, to find that they lived in a separate quarter of the town, altogether distinct from the other Jews, who never spoke of them without contumely; and they even declared, that if they saw a Christian in danger of being drowned, it would be their duty to make a bridge of a *Karaite* in order to rescue him. In short, they carry their enmity to such a pitch, that they will not receive a *Karaite* into their communion until he has previously made a profession of the Mohammedan or Christian faith.

The *Karaim*, on the contrary, though they execrate the traditions of the *Rabbinists*, never speak of their persons with contempt, but commonly give them the fraternal appellation אודני הרבנים, "our brethren, the Rabbinists."

It may not be amiss, in this place, to furnish the reader with some account of the mode of public worship in use among the *Karaim*, an opportunity of observing which was presented, on my visit to their synagogue in the town of *Lutsk*.

This visit took place on the day of Pentecost, 1821. The synagogue, which is situated in the back part of the town, is a square wooden building, capable of containing about two hundred people. The entrance is from the east, and leads immediately into the outer court, which is appropriated to the use of the females, and is divided from the rest of the synagogue by a thin partition, in which is a chink to admit of hearing and observing what is transacted within. Directly in front of the entrance, and fixed to the western wall, is the Ark of the Covenant, containing the book of the law, the front of which is covered

¹ Entdecktes Judenthum, Vol. I. p. 305.

² וביניהם ובין הרבנים שהם תלמידי חכמים מחיצה—
Lüner, ed. Elz. p. 28.

with a veil about eight feet in length by two and a half in breadth. Besides this veil are two smaller, one on each side, covering the prayer-books and other things requisite for the use of the officiating Rabbi. Close to the ark is a small reading-desk, somewhat in the shape of a music-stand, where the Levite, or minister, assists at certain parts of the service; and in front, near the middle of the synagogue, stands a square table, painted blue, and adorned with two coverlets, one of woollen stuff of various colours, and the other of silk richly embroidered and ornamented. On each side of this table stands a large candlestick, with seven branches, filled with wax candles; and, at different distances, round the synagogue, stand a number of reading-desks, each of which has a box containing such books as are used in the time of service.

Instead of the larger and smaller *Talith* (טלית), or white woollen garments, which the other Jews put on when they go into the synagogue, the Karaim use two long belts of woollen stuff, which are thrown over the shoulders, and joined behind by a square piece of the same material, which is more or less ornamented according to the circumstances of the owner. To the corners of this piece are attached the *Tzitzith* (ציצית), or long fringes, or ornamented strings, which the wearer puts together at different parts of the service, especially before the reading of the law, and, having kissed them, places them upon his eyes, as a sign that the divine commandments, of which these strings are symbolical, are the only medium of light to the mind. The custom is founded on Numbers xv. 38—40.

The Rabbi was dressed in a long robe of black silk, over which a large white *Talith* was thrown, which covered his head, and hung down nearly to the bottom of his robe. The prevailing dress of the people was a long blue top coat, lined with lambskin, and large lambskin caps, in the Tartar manner.

The service of the day had commenced before I went, so that I found them already advanced to the reading of different parts of the Scriptures. I am not aware that it is known among Christians, but it is certainly deserving of notice, that the celebrated prophecy, quoted by the Apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, from the prophet Joel, chapter ii. 28—32, forms a part of the Pentacostal service of the Karaite Jews. Such, however, is the fact, and may we not conclude, from the pertinacity with which this ancient sect adhere to their primitive institutions, that the same coincidence took place in the Apostolic age; that, in the

divine prescience, those who selected the Haphtorahs or sections from the prophets to be read in the synagogues, were directed to choose this passage from Joel for the particular feast on which it was to receive its proper and remarkable accomplishment; and, that the Apostle Peter, in quoting the lesson for the day, had recourse to one of the most powerful arguments which he could possibly have used, in order to convince a Jew of the divine nature of the transactions exhibited on that stupendous occasion?

Nearly two hours were spent in repeating prayers, and reading passages out of the Psalms and the Prophets, in all of which the congregation took a greater share than the Rabbi, who, at certain intervals fell down on his knees, and bowed with his face to the ground. At length that part of the service commenced, which is preparatory to the manifestation of the law. It consisted chiefly in prayers, which were repeated with uncommon earnestness; the congregation lifting up their hands, and elevating their voice, while, at regular intervals, the words, "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah," were repeated with much solemnity. The Ark was then opened, and the law brought out with great reverence, and placed endwise upon the table of testimony. The upper end of the roll was ornamented with a crown, on the top of which was infixed a precious stone, and at different distances hung small silver tablets, the gifts of zealous members of the congregation. The numerous wrappings were no sooner taken off, than the worshippers pressed forward to kiss them; after which, a deputation of three little boys came in from the outer court, and receiving them into their extended arms, conveyed them out to the females, who also kissed them and placed them on their eyes, in the same manner as the men had done.

The law was now laid flat on the table, and the minister addressed the officiating priest in the following words:

"Thou, therefore, my father, O Priest, the crown of my head, give glory to the law, and approach to read in the book of the law: approach with reverence."

On which the congregation repeated, in Hebrew, the divine promise to Phinehas: "*And it shall be to him and his seed after him, a covenant of everlasting priesthood; because he was zealous for his God, and made an atonement for the children of Israel,*" Numb. xxv. 13; and in Chaldee: "*And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children*

of the captivity, kept the dedication of the house of God with joy," Ezra vi. 16.

Having repeated certain introductory sentences from the 119th Psalm, the Rabbi began the lesson: "In the third month of the exodus of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt," etc. Exod. xix. 1.

When he had finished this portion, he quoted the words: "*Blessed be Jehovah God, the God of Israel*, etc. Psalm lxxii. 18, 19, and the minister, turning to a young man that was standing by, said:

"*And thou, my brother, O Levite, give glory to the law, and approach to read in the book of the law; approach with reverence.*"

To which the congregation gave in response:

"*And to Levi he said: Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy Holy One, whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah.*"

The Levite then came forward and repeated several passages from the Psalms, Job, and the book of Proverbs, and read several verses of the lesson, concluding with the words: "*Blessed be Jehovah God, the God of Israel; and blessed be his glorious name for ever.*"

The rest of the lesson was read by certain individuals from the congregation, who were in like manner summoned in turn by the minister, with the words:

"*And thou, my brother, O Israelite, give glory to the law, and approach to read in the book of the law; approach with reverence.*"

Having read to the commencement of Exodus xx, the whole congregation stood some time in silence, till the Rabbi began to repeat, in Hebrew, the ten commandments, which the congregation immediately repeated after him in Tartar, each commandment apart. The concluding part of the chapter was then read; and after a general ascription of glory to the Supreme Lawgiver, during which the law was rolled up and replaced in the Ark, the minister turned to one of the people and addressed him thus:

"*And thou, my son, O Dismissor,¹ give glory to the law, and approach to read the lesson; approach with reverence.*"

To which the congregation replied:

¹ מַפְטִיר, *Maphtir*—so called because he finishes the lesson previous to the dismissal of the congregation.

"Hear, my son, the instruction of thy father; and forsake not the law of thy mother. Hear, O my son, and receive my sayings; and the years of thy life shall be many."

This *Maphtir* was a fine-looking boy, about thirteen years of age, who read the prayer of Habbakuk in Hebrew, with a pathos and beauty which quite astonished me.

The service ended with the repetition of a long metrical prayer; on which the congregation after a few silent aspirations, retired to the outer court where they had left their shoes, and went away with great decorum.

Having addressed one of the Karaim who stood next to me, in Turkish, his countenance which had formerly expressed surprise at my looking over the service-book, now brightened up as if he had discovered a brother; and, after exchanging a few sentences, he introduced me to the Rabbi, who kindly invited me to visit him at his house in the afternoon. I accordingly went at the time appointed, and found his room filled with Karaites of both sexes, who had assembled to listen to our conversation. He gave me a hearty "Come in peace;" and, without reserve, entered into an explanation of the peculiar dogmas of their faith. Instead of manifesting that disquietude which generally seizes the mind of a Rabbinist, the moment the subject of the *Messiah* is introduced, my host discovered no alarm, but assured me that he is the object of their daily expectation. Such passages as I quoted from the Old Testament he explained much in the same way as the more ancient of the Jewish Rabbins, and appeared to have little or no knowledge of the numerous subterfuges to which the modern Talmudists have recourse in controversy with Christians. On my referring to the Hebrew New Testament, a copy of which I intended to present to him, he rose and produced one from his library, which bore evident marks of having been read, and which he handed to the people to read without any reluctance. "They had read," he said, "the accounts it contained respecting Jesus of Nazareth; but they were not convinced that he was the Messiah promised to the fathers."

It was peculiarly interesting to behold a company of the seed of Abraham, listening with deep attention to the discussion of that important subject which their law typified, their prophets predicted, their poets sang, and all the ancient worthies of their nation realized by a believing anticipation; and as I left them, my prayers ascended on their behalf, that as on that blessed day the effusion of the Holy Spirit effected the conversion of three

thousand souls, for a wave offering of first fruits to the Lord—so the general ingathering might speedily commence, and all Israel be saved with an everlasting salvation.

That the Karaim of Poland and the Crimea possessed a Targum, or version of the Old Testament in a Tartar dialect, has long been known to the literary world. Gustavus Peringer not only notices it, but gives a specimen of its manner, consisting of the three first verses of Genesis, in his epistle relative to the affairs of the Karaim in Lithuania, inserted in Tenzel's Monthly Accounts, 1691. From this source Wolf derived his information respecting it, which is contained in the fourth volume of his *Bibliothecae Hebraeae*, page 167. It is also referred to by the Swedish traveller, Biörnstaël, in his account of the Karaim inhabiting the village of Haskiöl, near Constantinople, where he was shown a copy of the Pentateuch in the year 1776.¹

Of this version a copy was purchased for the sum of 200 rubles by Dr. Pinkerton, on his visit to Djusut-Kalè, in the year 1816, who forwarded it to Petersburg with a view to its being printed along with the translation of the New Testament made by the Missionaries at Karass. It was, however, deemed advisable by the Committee of the Russian Bible Society, that previous to their undertaking a work of such magnitude, the MS. should be forwarded to Astrakhan, to be examined by the Missionaries resident in that city. It was accordingly submitted to their judgment, and, on its being found to exhibit a dialect of the Tartar very different from any with which they were acquainted, the idea of associating the version with that of the New Testament executed at Karass, was entirely abandoned, and it was resolved, that an edition of the Book of Genesis, with such alterations as the Missionaries might deem proper, should be printed by way of trial.

The MS. is neatly written in the Rabbinical character, with the addition of certain marks and points in connexion with some of the letters, in order to make them suit the Tartar alphabet.

It has been affirmed, that the dialect in which this MS. is written, constitutes what has been termed *Djagatai*, or as the Tartars pronounce it, *Shagaltai*; but the assertion is purely hypothetical, and in perfect contradiction to the united testimony of history and experience. The name *Djagatai* is evidently

¹ Michaelis' Orient. u. Exeget. Bibliothek. xv. Theil. p. 93.

derived from one of the sons of Djingis-Khan, who, on the death of his father, obtained, as his share of the Tartar empire, the countries east of the Caspian, known by the names of Transoxiana, Ugoria, Kashgar, Bedakshan, Bukharia, and Balk, and which, by some geographers, have been comprised under the general name of Zagatai; but there never appears to have existed a people to whom this name was exclusively appropriated. Were it a fact that the dialect of the MS. ever formed the language of any nation or tribe to the east of the Caspian, or in central Asia, it would throw great light on the question relative to the ten tribes, as it is incontrovertible that none but Jews ever spoke any such language. The words, indeed, in general, are not Hebrew; but every thing else is. Not only is the same order of the words retained which exists in the original, but every idiom and grammatical form; and every particle of the Hebrew is so rigidly expressed, that with little trouble, the whole might be rendered back again into Hebrew, so as to furnish an exact copy of the exemplar from which it was made. Indeed, its servility is such, that, besides now and then suggesting a proper Tartar word to a translator, it is of no practical use whatever—the Tartar and Hebrew languages differing so entirely in their structure and conformation. It is accordingly found that, though portions of it have been transcribed into Arabic characters, it still remains a sealed book to every Tartar or Turk into whose hands it is put. And even Jews from the west of the Caspian, who speak the Tartar as their vernacular language, are not able to make out its meaning, not being acquainted with the Hebrew—a circumstance which makes it evident that no person who is not conversant with the original language of the Old Testament can possibly understand it.

It is therefore only in a critical point of view that the Karaite MS. can be considered as possessing any value. The rigidity with the which sect, for whose use it was made, profess to adhere to the text of Scripture, naturally leads to the conclusion, that it will be found faithfully to exhibit the readings of the manuscript from which it was taken. But even here our expectations are only partially met. For it turns out, on examination, that the translation is not independent, or constructed on any principles of interpretation peculiar to the Karaite school; but that the translator has not unfrequently followed the Chaldee Targums, and those renderings which are to be met with in the Rabbinical commentaries.

ART. III. ON THE ALLEGED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN JAMES II. 14—26, AND PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

By Charles Frommann, Cand. of Theol. in Coburg. Translated from the German.
By D. Fosdick Jr. of the Theol. Sem. Andover.

From a very early period it has been frequently remarked, that the purport of James 2 : 14—26, in which a justifying power is attributed to the works of men and not to faith alone, appears to stand in direct opposition to Paul's doctrine respecting *justification by faith*, so strongly enforced by him, particularly in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. It was this appearance, more especially, which cast suspicion even in the ancient church upon the genuineness of the Epistle of James; which has ever occasioned highly unfavourable opinions in regard to it; and which also led Luther to pass upon it the well known severe sentence in his Preface to the Epistles of James and Jude. At all periods, however, the attempt has been made to remove, or at least soften down, the discrepancy between the two apostles;¹ and recently, through the influence of Knapp and Neander in particular,² the opinion has become almost uni-

¹ In the ancient church compare the words of Augustine, for example; Quaest. Octog. Trium. Quaest. LXXVI. "Quapropter non sunt sibi contrariae duorum apostolorum sententiae, Pauli et Jacobi, quum dicit unus, justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus, et alius dicit, inanem esse fidem sine operibus; quia ille dicet de operibus, quae fidem praecedunt, iste de iis quae fidem sequuntur; sicut etiam ipse Paulus multis locis ostendit." So, too, the *Conf. Helv. post. c. XV*, "Jacobus loquitur de fide inani et mortua, quam quidam jactabant; ita ille dixit, opera justificare, non contradicens apostolo, alioquin rejiciendus, sed ostendens, Abraham vivam et justificantem fidem per opera declaravisse."

² See Knapp, "De dispari formula loquendi, qua Christus, Paulus atque Jacobus de fide et factis disserentes uti sunt," contained in his *Scripta varii argum.* p. 413; and Neander: "Paulus und Jakobus, die Einheit des evangelischen Glaubens in verschiedenen Formen," in his "Kleine Gelegenheitschriften." [Translated in the *Bibl. Repos.* III. p. 189 sq.]

versal, that there exists between them no real discrepancy, and that this appearance of discrepancy is nothing but appearance. This opinion, however, is not so generally received but that there are voices in opposition to it; and of these one of the most weighty is *De Wette's*, who, in his "Einleitung in's N. T." professes to discover an actual discrepancy between Paul and James; while in another place¹ he has endeavoured to show a polemical reference to Paul's Epistles on the part of James. He declares, at the same time, that nothing but sinister motives or preconceived opinions would have induced any to oppose a thing so perfectly plain; and that the polemical character of the passage in James would hardly have been denied, had it not been for the secret wish to do away a contradiction between the apostles. As, therefore, the dispute in regard to this not unimportant part of biblical theology cannot be considered as by any means decided, it may not perhaps be useless to venture another essay in confirmation of the common opinion. Its aim will be, not so much, to present a great deal that is new, as to collect arguments now scattered in various quarters, in order to invalidate, at least in a degree, the opinion of *De Wette*.

To qualify ourselves to judge correctly concerning the contradiction said to exist between the doctrines of Paul and James, we must first comprehend the nature of this discrepancy. This we can best do, if we investigate the import of the passage in question in James, and compare it with the teaching of the apostle Paul relative to the same point.

James expresses fully at the outset, v. 14, the sentiment which he expands in the whole passage, chap. 2: 14—26, in saying that 'faith without works profits nothing, and therefore cannot save a man.' From the antithesis between *πίστις* and *ἔργα* here presented, it is clear that by *πίστις* in this passage nothing more is meant than a barely external acknowledgment, a mere historical belief in revealed truth, an empty Lord, Lord! which wholly wants the confirmation of a holy life and a conduct acceptable to God. It is well to remark further, how evident it is from the form of speech, *ἐὰν πίστιν λέγῃ τις ἔχειν*, that James is here opposing men who boasted of their *πίστις*, although they were without *ἔργα*, and that the sense just assigned to *πίστις* in this passage, (whether correct or incorrect we will not now decide,) is the same as that which was affixed to the

¹ Theol. Studien u. Kritiken, 1830, 2tes Heft.

word by the readers of the Epistle.—*Σωτηρίας* is here employed with its usual pregnant meaning, according to which it signifies 'to obtain eternal life, the eternal happiness promised us by Christ.'

In v. 15—17 the apostle presents an example in support of his position, by which to show that faith without works, such as that which the readers of his Epistle were wont to boast, wanted true life in itself, and therefore could not vivify and save mankind. As the simple assurance of one's compassion towards those in distress, without actual alleviation of their necessities, is but a tissue of vain, unmeaning, inoperative words, so (v. 17) faith without works is dead in itself, i. e. is perfectly empty and idle, has no life in itself, and can therefore impart no saving efficacy.

In v. 18—23, James uses the form of a dialogue; for with the words *ἀλλ' ἔπειτα*, 'but some one may justly say,' he introduces a person defending real faith in his sense of the word against a hypocrite, such as we have described above. This dialogue is perceptible from the forms in the singular, *οὐ ἔχεις* v. 18, *οὐ πιστεύεις* v. 19, *θέλεις* v. 20, *βλέπεις* v. 22; while in v. 24, the plural form recurs, *οὔτε*.

The speaker first reminds those hypocrites, v. 18, that they could never convince any one of the reality of their faith by boasting of it, so long as they exhibited no works; because a dead faith, as such, can have no existence to others, being wanting entirely in a criterion from which its existence may be inferred; while on the contrary, a real, active faith may be known directly from the works which proceed from it.—But supposing, he continues, you really have the faith in religious truths which you pretend and avow with your lips, and yet do not permit it to have any influence over your life, but, on the contrary, lead a dissolute and disreputable life, you can reap no advantage from it, since you cannot obtain eternal life by it. *Μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σώσαι ὑμᾶς*, v. 14.—This the apostle illustrates, v. 19, by a very apt example, viz. Even the devils believe in the truth, that there is one God; but instead of securing eternal life, they rather live in constant terror and misery, because they do not live in conformity with this belief.

In v. 20 James prepares to demonstrate his position that faith without works has no power unto salvation, in a manner which would be peculiarly forcible to Jewish Christians.—The epithet, *κατὰ*, seems to refer to that ostentatious boasting which, however

much it may assume, is really empty and vain. Comp. 1 Cor. 13: 1.—*Νεκρά* has here a somewhat different sense from *νεκρά καθ' ἑαυτήν* in v. 17. What is *dead* no longer exists as *that which it once was*, and so far is a nonentity. In this sense it was said before of faith without works, that it was dead in itself. What is dead, too, is no longer capable of exercising the functions which it once exercised, and is therefore *inactive, inefficacious*. In this sense particularly, is it used here, 'faith without works is dead.' Now as the effect of true faith is said to be eternal salvation, this is equivalent to saying, 'faith without works cannot procure a man eternal salvation'—*οὐ δύναται σωσαι αὐτόν*, v. 14.

This point the apostle aims to prove by the example of Abraham, v. 21—23. We have here the expressions *δικαιοῦσθαι* v. 21, and from the Septuagint version *ἐλογίσθη αἰς δικαιοσύνην*, v. 23. An inquiry arises what relation these bear to the word *σώζεσθαι* used before? James himself explains these expressions in v. 23, by adding, *καὶ φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη*. Hence, an *ἄνθρωπος δικαιοῦν* is, according to him, one who has gained the favour of God, who thus stands in a right relation to God, and is capable of being saved, *σώζεσθαι*. *Δικαιοῦσθαι* is therefore the antecedent of *σώζεσθαι*, and is related to it as the moving cause is to the consequence. It is then of no essential importance that James uses these words interchangeably.—He now proceeds to show that even Abraham, although in Gen. 15: 6 it is said that his faith was counted to him for righteousness, was yet justified on account of his works. The course he takes to prove this is the following. He first, v. 21, introduces the position to be proved, viz. that Abraham was justified by his works, and this because he showed himself ready to sacrifice his son, as had been enjoined upon him, the son upon whom rested the divine promise of a numerous posterity. Hence it appears, v. 22, that the faith of Abraham was an active operative faith, and consequently not *νεκρά*, since it exhibited itself in works and wrought with his works, *ὅτι ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ*, and that it was a true and perfect faith, and not *νεκρά καθ' ἑαυτήν*, because it consisted of the two parts, feeling and action, *ὅτι ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη*. Thus the true *πίστις* (in the sense of James) consists of two parts, the *πίστις* in the stricter sense, such as was boasted by the readers of the Epistle, the firm, internal conviction of divine truth; and the *ἔργα*, as the necessary complement of the proper *πίστις*. In Abraham both were

united; he possessed true, perfect faith. Consequently, James means to say, the position in v. 21 does not at all contradict Scripture, (*καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή* v. 23,) which makes Abraham's justification to depend upon his faith. For it there speaks of true faith, so far as it is proved to be such by *ἔργα*. The apostle's conclusion deduced regularly would run thus: Scripture makes the justification of Abraham to depend upon his faith. Now the faith of Abraham was a perfect and efficacious faith, inasmuch as it exhibited itself by works. Hence it is not anti-scriptural to maintain that Abraham was justified by his works; since it was these which proved his faith to be sincere. Consequently, (concludes James in v. 24, where he again speaks in his own person,) a man is justified by his works, and not by a mere feeling of faith.

In confirmation of this position the apostle further cites, in v. 25, the example of the harlot Rahab. It is related in Josh. 2: 1 sq. and 6: 17 sq. that the harlot Rahab, having harboured the spies sent by Joshua before the siege of Jericho, and preserved them from the search of the king of Jericho, and aided them in their escape, from the conviction that the Israelites, in whom God had so often and so miraculously glorified himself, would take the city, was pardoned by Joshua for this important service, and spared with her whole family in the general destruction of the city. Rahab also, James means to say, would not have been delivered at the destruction of Jericho, had her faith that God would give the city into the hands of the Israelites been a dead faith, had it not been active in the harbouring and subsequent safe dismissal of the Israelitish spies.

In conclusion there follows, v. 26, a comparison: "As the body without the soul is dead, so also is faith without works." A faith that wants the internal moving principle which produces works is no faith at all—is nothing: just as a soulless body which likewise has no life in it, is also nothing.

On the other hand, Paul maintains in many passages that it is not by works man is justified before God, but by faith in Jesus Christ, (see Rom. 3: 20, 21, 28. Gal. 2: 16,) on account of which God of his mercy grants us salvation, not because of our merits, Eph. 2: 8, 9. Abraham also was justified before God not on account of his desert, but from the free motion of divine grace, which he obtained by his *faith*, as the Scriptures declare. Gen. 15: 6. See Rom. 4: 1 sq. Gal. 3: 6 sq.

There are two questions, now, which press themselves upon us in this comparison of the doctrine of James with that of Paul: I. Are there any indications in this passage of James, or in the Epistle at large, which make it necessary to suppose a *direct polemical reference* to the doctrine of Paul? II. In case this question be answered in the negative, is there in fact *real discrepancy* between the two apostles, or is it only *apparent*?

From even a cursory consideration of the passage in James, it will be easy to perceive, it is said, along with the most decided opposition in the thoughts, a great and striking resemblance to the words and turns of expression of the apostle Paul. James says 2: 24, 'Ὁρᾷτε ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦνται ἄνθρωποι, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον. Paul says on the other hand, Rom. 3: 28, *Λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον, χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.* Comp. further James 2: 17, 25, with Rom. 3: 20 Gal. 2: 16. James says 2: 21, 'Αβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη; Paul, on the other hand, Rom. 4: 1, *Τί οὖν σάρα: Εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη.*—In the passages just cited, James makes use of the expression *δικαιοῦσθαι*, even in connexion with the words *ἐκ πίστεως, ἐξ ἔργων*, a mode of expression, which is peculiar to the apostle Paul, and is elsewhere found in this sense only in Luke who was so intimate with Paul. Further, James refers, 2: 21 sq. to the example of Abraham, Gen. 15: 6. So also Paul, Rom. 4: 1 sq. Gal. 3: 6 sq. James likewise, 2: 25, applies to his purpose the remarkable example of the harlot Rahab, a very equivocal person, and who besides is nowhere else in Scripture held up, like Abraham, as an example of faith. Now this circumstance may be well explained, it is said, by supposing that James was induced to cite this singular example by the passage in Heb. 11: 31, where the writer (who if not Paul himself, was yet some one very familiar with Paul's doctrines) is led by his peculiar train of thought to present Rahab as a heroine of faith. Such, very nearly, is De Wette's representation.

Taking all this together, the supposition is certainly natural, it is said, that James had reference to the doctrine of the apostle Paul; and as at all events James was opposing an error, the inference seems to be authorized, that a polemical reference on the part of James to the doctrine of Paul must be admitted. To this is to be added, it is further said, that throughout the whole Epistle of James a multitude more of allusions to Pauline passa-

ges and expressions have been discovered,¹ and that the disciples of James in Antioch, generally appear as the opposers of Paul's principles, Gal. 2 : 12—16.²

Yet all these appearances may be satisfactorily explained, without the necessity of supposing an intentional direct reference to Paul on the part of James. That James was in fact acquainted with Paul's Epistles, and intended to combat them in his own Epistle, is a position which it would be difficult to defend. For, although sometimes, as is clear from Col. 4 : 16 and 1 Thess. 5 : 27, the Epistles of Paul were communicated to all the members of the church and even to other churches; yet the circumstance that Paul in these passages desires a more extended communication of his letter, and the manner in which he requests it, show that this was not customary; so that it is not easy to conceive how James, who was constantly resident in Jerusalem, could have obtained a sight of these Epistles of the apostle of the Gentiles. In speaking, therefore, of a polemical reference on the part of James to the doctrines of Paul, we are to understand by them the peculiar doctrines of the apostle which he taught orally in his apostolical labours, and with which James might very easily have become acquainted.—But even in this sense the supposition of a direct controversy between the two apostles, will prove to be by no means necessary; as we shall attempt to show by a particular examination of the reasons adduced in support of it.

As to the circumstance that the two apostles concur in appealing to the example of Abraham, it will not appear surprising, if it be considered with what national pride the Jews regarded their ancestor, and that they were wont in all cases to refer to Abraham as their model. And it was precisely his inflexible confidence in God, and his religious life, referred to by both Paul and James, for which he was elsewhere also extolled among the Jews. This pre-eminence of Abraham is celebrated in Heb. 11 : 8; and also in Eccclus. 44 : 20, where it is said : *Συνετήρησεν (Ἀβραάμ) νόμον ὑψίστου, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἔστησε διαθήκην, καὶ ἐν πειρασμῶν εὐρίσθη πιστός.*

¹ See Pott's *Prolegg.* in *Epp. Cathol.* p. 36. Hug's *Einleit.* ins *N. T.* Th. II. p. 514. 3d. ed. Schott's *Isagoge Hist. Crit.* in *libros N. T.* § 91. note 20.

² Comp. Augusti's *Version of the cath. Epp. with Excursus and introductory Essays*, and De Wette's *Einleit.* ins *N. T.* p. 317, 2d ed. Vol. IV. No. 16. 88

Thus too the dying Mattathias, 1 Macc. 2 : 62, pointed his sons to the example of Abraham with the words : Ἀβραάμ οὐχὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὗρέθη πιστὸς καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; Lastly Abraham is thus represented as a hero of faith by Philo the Alexandrian, in his work : *Quis rerum divinarum hæres?* p. 493. Ed. Frankfort.

The citation of the example of Rahab seems more to imply a reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and thus indirectly to the doctrines of Paul. The question here arises, Whence this strange and far-fetched example? How comes it that the apostle should present so equivocal a person as a pattern of active faith, worthy of imitation? De Wette says : This example is so remarkable, that its citation by James cannot be accounted for without supposing him to have borrowed it from the Epistle to the Hebrews, or possibly from the oral discourses of Paul; in which, however, if it occurred there at all, it must have been derived from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But a great deal may, nevertheless, be urged against this opinion. In the first place, it is clear from the nature of the case that the story of Rahab must have had at that time among the Jews a certain degree of celebrity. Otherwise, how should James have mentioned it in connexion with the universally known story of Abraham? How could he, to accomplish his object, appeal to an example which was obscure and known only to a few? If it be assumed that the story of Rahab first obtained this celebrity by means of the epistle to Hebrews, it is then taken for granted that the Epistle to the Hebrews was composed a considerable time before the Epistle of James. Otherwise, the example of Rahab could not have obtained extensive celebrity in the course of oral instruction, nor have been adopted in the epistle of James. This however is a supposition which stands very much in need of strict proof.

But, granting that the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews did precede, by a considerable period, that of the Epistle of James, little is gained by the admission. We can hardly discern, indeed, any occasion why James should cite this example after the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. If he desired to show the accordance of his own doctrine with the purport of the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, this example could do no such thing, because the word *faith* is used in a different signification, denoting a conviction of the reality of things beyond the senses; while in the Epistle of James that faith is spoken of which is the internal vivifying principle of the Christian. If he desired

by citing this example to controvert the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he failed entirely; for even the latter speaks of an operative faith, adducing (v. 31) as proof of Rahab's faith, that she received the spies of the Israelites with peace.

And then the question may be justly put: Why did James select from the passage in Hebrews just this unfamiliar and singular example, while it afforded him so many which are familiar and wholly to the point? No other reason can be assigned than the same which must have induced the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to cite it, viz. that it seemed well adapted to his purpose; and thus it would be no more strange in the case of James, that he should have fallen upon this example of Rahab, than it is in the case of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

If now we may infer from the use which is made of the story of Rahab, both by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and by James, that it must have acquired a particular celebrity among the Jews of that day—which moreover is by no means strange in respect to an important occurrence in the heroic period of the history of the Israelites—we cannot doubt, also, that the use of this story on the part of the apostle at that time, would appear not at all remarkable or unpleasant, as perhaps it might appear to us now. Comp. the commentators on Hebrews, l. c. The only remaining inquiry then is, whether there be not something in the story itself, which makes the independent citation of it by James for his purpose intelligible or probable? And certainly the apostle could hardly have adduced an example better fitted to show that man is justified by works, than this of the harlot Rahab, a Gentile, of whom no one could assert that she was distinguished by any remarkable faith, and was saved on that account;¹ as might have been objected to the example of Abraham. And this example of Rahab appears to have been chosen in contrast to that of Abraham; as is denoted, too, by the mode of transition, v. 25 *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ*, these particles having an intensive signification, *in like manner also even, or, not only so but even*, etc.

It remains only to speak of De Wette's remark, that James has used in this passage exactly Paul's expressions: *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως, ἔξ ἔργων*. Admitting it to be true that these expressions are peculiar to Paul, yet James may have been led to em-

¹ The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews could do this only from the general comprehensive idea which he affixed to the word *πίστις*.

ploy them here by the passage in Gen. 15:6 which he cites; where the Hebrew words, *הָאֵלֹהִים בְּרָא אֶת אַבְרָהָם*, are translated in the Alexandrian version by *ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*. This remark appears to be confirmed by the circumstance, that James does not use the expression before the mention of the example of Abraham. He uses instead, v. 14, *σῶσαι*, and in v. 17 and 20, *ἡ πίστις νεκρά ἐστίν*, instead of saying as in v. 24, *οὐκ ἐν πίστει μόνον ἄνθρωπος δικαιούται*. He first uses the word *δικαιούν* in v. 21, doubtless because the passage which he is about to quote, is in his mind. Nevertheless, as James still uses this word in speaking of Rahab, when there was no further occasion for it, and also connects with it the words *ἐκ πίστεως* and *ἐξ ἔργων*, it is possible that he continues to employ it in v. 24 sq. as an expression made current especially by Paul, and generally intelligible. And, indeed, there is nothing strange in this. For since Paul was regarded as the first and principal of the apostles, both on account of the extent of his sphere of labour, and the great success of his exertions in the ministry, it was natural that the disciples and the other evangelists should endeavour to form themselves upon his model, and use the phraseology he employed; and that there should in general arise a Pauline type or model of teaching, which was followed by the apostles without any intention or even consciousness on their part. This Knapp also endeavours to render probable, l. c. p. 444.

This observation suffices, also, to explain fully the agreement of several ideas and turns of expression in James with those of Paul, of which we have before spoken. It is in general very hazardous to refer such resemblances between two writings to a direct dependence of the one upon the other. In the second Epistle of Peter, (or whoever may have been the author,) there are many passages—more indeed than in the Epistle of James—which have the greatest resemblance to passages in Paul's writings; and probably many other examples of the kind might easily be found. Schott also remarks, that in this instance we are by no means to infer from the mutual agreement of the two apostles, that James intentionally imitated Paul. *Isagog.* l. c.

"But we see from Gal. 2:11—16, that Paul blames Peter, and contradicts his principles, as to the obligation of the Jewish ceremonial law upon Gentile Christians. Now that Peter's sentiments were those of the persons sent by James to Antioch Gal. 2:12, is clear, from the fact that on their arrival he changed his conduct towards the Gentile Christians, and on this

very account fell into controversy with Paul. Hence it follows, that the principles of James himself were opposed to those of Paul; and that it is consistent and natural to assume in the case before us a controversial relation between the two apostles." Thus Augusti and De Wette ll. cc. Now even admitting the soundness of these premises, yet the conclusion; that because the principles of Paul conflicted with those of the disciples of James, they were also in conflict with those of James himself, seems much too precipitate and hazardous. But much may also be objected to the premises. In the first place, the question arises, Were the *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, Gal. 2 : 12, really disciples of James? This is not asserted in the expression used, considered in itself; and it is very probable, as is observed by Winer, in his commentary on Gal. l. c. that these *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* belonged to the sect of the rigid Jewish Christians, who are mentioned in Acts 15 : 1 sq. 21 : 20 sq. and that they were the same whom Paul denominates *κατασκοπεύοντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν*, Gal. 2 : 4. The same opinion is maintained by Knapp, (p. 451. Bibl. Repos. III. p. 218,) who explains the phrase *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* as meaning certain persons who were merely messengers of James, or occupants of the same house with him, or members of the church of which James was then the head at Jerusalem. But although this cannot be maintained with absolute certainty, so much at least is clear, viz. that we can by no means infer from Gal. 2 : 12 sq. that there was any difference between the doctrines of Paul and Peter, or that there was an agreement between Peter and the messengers of James. Peter is not rebuked by Paul for entertaining a different opinion from his own in regard to the obligation of the Mosaic ceremonial law upon Gentile Christians; but because, too indulgent towards the weak, he had favoured their errors and prejudices contrary to his own conviction, and had thus brought a stain on his own integrity. That Peter in his conduct had really belied his own conviction, and that he agreed with Paul as to the point in question, is evident from the plural form, *εἰδότες*, which Paul uses in his reprimand of Peter, v. 16. Besides, it is scarcely conceivable, that men who, in the apostolical council at Jerusalem, declared so decidedly in favour of freeing the Gentiles from the burden of the Mosaic ceremonial law as had Peter and James, should have veered suddenly round to the opposite opinion. See Acts 15 : 6 sq. espec. v. 10, 11, 19.

The conclusion from all which has been hitherto said is, that

the remarkable appearances which present themselves on comparing the passage in question with the doctrine of Paul, by no means require the assumption of a designed reference to Paul on the part of James, yea, that such a reference is not even probable; but that all these appearances can be satisfactorily accounted for in another way. Hence, if James has in fact contradicted Paul, it must have been without design and accidentally.

This now is just our *second* question, viz. Whether James does really contradict Paul, or whether this is only apparently the case? We may now attempt to answer this question with freedom, without incurring the reproach of following a preconceived opinion; since we have shown by the previous investigation, that no scientific difficulty can any further lie in our way.

But there is certainly also a positive reason, why we should endeavour to harmonize the doctrines of the two apostles. For if James, in opposition to Paul, made the justification of man to depend on his works alone,¹ he would assert what, as De Wette rightly remarks, would be utterly false and dangerous to good morals; because the works of men can never constitute a claim to the divine favour, and because such a position would give support to every species of hypocrisy. The controversy of James with Paul, therefore, would be a total failure, and so unworthy of an apostle that, with De Wette,² we might reasonably doubt, whether James were really the author of the Epistle current under his name. This doubt would vanish, and James, who throughout the rest of the Epistle exhibits himself as so enlightened and so thoroughly imbued with the Christian spirit, would be exempted from the suspicion of a gross absurdity, if it can be shown that the discrepancy between him and Paul is only apparent.

In order to prove this, two principal methods have been adopted. The first is, to argue that the three words *πίστις*, *δικαιοσύνη*, *ἔργα*, have an entirely different signification with James, from that which they have with Paul. *Πίστις*, it is

¹ That James does not, as De Wette asserts, contradict the doctrine of Paul in making the justification of men dependent upon works and faith together, is shown hereafter.

² Einleit. in's N. Test. p. 317.

said, always denotes with Paul the internal principle of christian life, which, being a confident reliance on God and Jesus who has rescued us from sin and misery by his death, must be in itself living and productive, and exhibit itself in the whole life. Hence Paul could not possibly speak of a dead faith, in this sense, because he regarded faith only as always operative. It is otherwise with James. He understands by *πίστις* only an historical assent to the christian doctrines. *δικαιοσύνη*, which with Paul denotes the condition or state of justification, in which man, saved by faith in Jesus from eternal punishment for his sins, has the hope of eternal happiness, signifies with James merely a condition in which man has rendered himself worthy of the complacency of God and is loaded by him with blessings and benefits. Lastly, *ἔργα*, used alone, always signifies with Paul *ἔργα νόμου*; with James, on the other hand, *ἔργα πίστεως*, i. e. true virtue.¹

But the correctness of this view, thus generally presented, is very doubtful. First, as to the word *πίστις*. It is indeed true that in James 2: 14–22, it cannot be understood otherwise than in the sense thus assigned; but, on account of the polemical character of the passage, we cannot thence infer, that James himself affixed this idea to the word. And, indeed, the other passages in his Epistle in which he employs the word *πίστις*, show that he understood it in the correct sense. In two passages, 1: 6. 5: 15, *πίστις* can, it is true, be taken only in its general signification, viz. a fixed confidence in God, by which we are convinced of his almighty power, through which, in conformity with his wisdom and goodness, he blesses us with great and unexpected benefits—a meaning, not unknown, to say the least, to Paul; see Col. 2: 12. With Paul, moreover, *πίστις* sometimes signifies in general the subjective religion, the religiousness of the Christian, inasmuch as this is founded on a firm and active faith in Christ; comp. 1 Cor. 16: 13. 2 Cor. 1: 24. Gal. 6: 10. So James uses this word in 1: 3, where the meaning, *confidence in God*, is too confined; also in 2: 1, where

¹ Thus particularly, C. C. Tittmann: "Sententia Jacobi apostoli c. 2, de fide, operibus et justificatione," in his *Opusc.* p. 253. Also Usteri: *Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffs*, p. 94. 2d ed. who, however, supposes a distinction between the two apostles only in respect to *πίστις* and *ἔργα*. Baumgarten-Crusius, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 434 etc.

the sense of *πίστις* is determined with sufficient clearness by the addition *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, (Rom. 3: 22, 26,) and in 2: 5 where *πίστις*, in distinction from *κόσμος*, denotes the religious sense as directed to what is elevated and divine. Even in the passages particularly under consideration, it is clear that the two apostles have essentially the same idea of *πίστις*. For James, 2: 22, in speaking of the faith of Abraham, describes it as consisting of feeling and action; precisely like Paul in Rom. 4: 1 sq.¹

The opinion, too, that the word *δικαιοσύνη* has a different sense in the two apostles, can hardly be justified. *Δικαιοσύνη* denotes in general the state of a man who stands in a right relation to God. This state, according to Paul, is conditioned on the *πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Now, as he who stands in the right relation to God, must necessarily enjoy the favour of God, and this again is inseparably connected with salvation and happiness, so *δικαιοσύνη* in its turn appears as the condition of *ζωή* and *σωτηρία*. Comp. Rom. 1: 16, 17. Eph. 2: 8. Tit. 3: 7. Rom. 5: 9, 17. Just so James makes *σωτηρία* dependent upon *πίστις*, 2: 14, omitting the intermediate idea of *δικαιοσύνη*. The word *σῶζεσθαι*, 2: 14, for which in 1: 25 stand the words *μακάριον εἶναι*, he afterwards exchanges for *δικαιοῦσθαι*, thus putting the ground or motive for the consequence; exactly as Paul also uses these two expressions promiscuously, whenever he passes over—as he often does, after the example of the Gospels²—the intermediate *δικαιοσύνη*, and makes *ζωή* or *σωτηρία* directly dependent on *πίστις*. Compare Eph. 2: 8, and Gal. 3: 9, where on occasion of citing the passage Gen. 12: 3, he uses the word *εὐλογεῖσθαι*. Hence it is not to be wondered at that both apostles should agree in applying the word *δικαιοῦσθαι* to Abraham according to Gen. 15: 6.

It is however doubtless true, in regard to the word *ἔργα*, that there is a difference between the two apostles; James meaning only the *ἔργα πίστεως*, when he makes *δικαιοσύνη* to depend upon them; and Paul the *ἔργα νόμου*, when he denies them any justifying power.

De Wette objects, that Paul manifestly denies justifying power even to the *ἔργα πίστεως*, because, though Abraham was not acquainted with any law, and therefore could not perform the

¹ Comp. the remarks above in regard to the passage adduced p. 686.

² See Usteri p. 96 sq.

works of the law, yet the apostle says of him even, that he was not justified by works; Rom. 4: 1 sq. But against this it may be observed, that the signification of νόμος with Paul is much more extensive; that it denotes not only the Mosaic law, but in general any moral obligation pressing upon man from without, which does not spring from an internal religious principle of faith. On the other hand, when Paul speaks of the effects of a real active faith, he either uses the word ἀγάπη, 1 Cor. c. 13, or he adds something to the word ἔργα, as ἀγαθά, καλά, etc. Rom. 2: 7, 10. Eph. 2: 10.¹

The second method which may be adopted to reconcile the discrepancy between the two Apostles, and which has been followed by Knapp and Neander among others, is to show that from the different positions both of the apostles themselves and of those to whom they directed their Epistles, the apostles, in their instructions, must have set out from an entirely different point of view; and the Epistles, therefore, out of reference to the peculiar wants of their readers, must have been written in a very different style and manner. In this way we shall certainly become convinced, that the expressions in question of the two apostles, cannot with any propriety be compared together; that, as no entire agreement can be proved, so no discrepancy can be made out between them; and that it would have been difficult even to have supposed any discrepancy, had not single clauses in James been considered out of their connexion, and, in consequence of the external form of his language, a direct controversy with Paul been taken for granted.

The appearance of Jesus upon earth effected a new creation. Christianity entered the world with the great truth, that "God is a Spirit and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth." It showed how God, of his infinite love had sent his Son into the world, that all who believe on him, might not perish, but have eternal life. Hence it made faith in Jesus, the Son of God, a condition of salvation; and this faith in Jesus, by the spiritual regeneration of man, by the renunciation of the old Adam or the condition of sin and ruin, was exalted to become the true sole principle of life in man; from which were to flow the works of love and piety, and consequently peace and happiness in the

¹ See Knapp's *Prolusio* in *loc. Rom. VII. 21*, in his *Scripta var. arg.* p. 394 sq. Usteri, p. 25 sq.

heart; and by which a new man was created who would live forever in holiness and purity before God. In this way Christianity came at once in conflict with the Mosaic offerings and ceremonial observances, with the whole of Gentile idol-worship, with all the Pharisaic-Jewish particularities, and with all mere external sanctity. The first who clearly perceived this, and felt it to the bottom of his heart, was the apostle Paul, who plainly declared that Judaism and Christianity were related to each other as the flesh and spirit, as the shadow and substance, as the imperfect type and the pure and perfect archetype. Paul sets out with the position, that Judaism makes the justification and with it the salvation of man to depend upon his *merits*, acquired by the observance of the law. Moses says: *Do this and thou shalt live*; Rom. 10: 5. Gal. 3: 12. But, says Paul, the perfect observance of the law by man is not possible, on account of his sinful nature, which perpetually hinders his doing well; Rom. 7: 18 sq. Experience also shows, that all, both Jews and Gentiles, are subject to sin; Rom. 2: 23 sq. 3: 9 sq. Consequently man cannot in this way obtain salvation; but, on the contrary, he first comes by the law to a consciousness of his sinfulness, and thus it adds to his misery; Rom. 3: 20. Gal. 3: 10. Further, it is impossible that man should have merit with God for which he can demand a *recompense*, Rom. 4: 4;—and hence it is a vain fancy in the Jews, to imagine that they stand in peculiar favour with God, as the descendants of Abraham, the heirs of the promises and possessors of the law; Rom. c. 2 —3: 9. 9: 6. On the contrary, man, as Christianity teaches us, is justified before God solely by his grace, without the law. Access to this divine grace is obtained by man through faith in Jesus Christ, particularly through faith in his atoning death; since God, for the sake of his Son, graciously receives us and bestows salvation upon us; Rom. 3: 21—25. Eph. 2: 8. Hence, as we are thus justified before God solely by his grace, and therefore cannot *merit* justification, it is plain that we are not justified by any *mere works*, whether works of the law or any other to which we are impelled by any external moral *obligation*; but that this can only happen through our *faith*, our entire and confiding devotion to Christ, which, elevated to become our internal principle of life, must be the occasion and motive of all our actions; and these then through this faith become works of love; Rom. 3: 20, 28. 4: 1 sq. Paul further shows how false was the Jewish idea, that the law was a suf-

ficient means for the justification and acceptance of man before God; and how objectionable therefore was the earnest endeavour of the Jewish Christians, to obtain a place for the Mosaic law by the side of the Gospel, as such a means of justification.

The disposition and conduct which James supposes in his readers are totally different. He contends, from 1 : 22 onward against that hypocritical sanctity, which pleases itself with the idea of gaining the appearance of virtue and holiness by ostentation and boasting, without any effort that the actions and the entire life should accord with this hypocritical language. He first speaks against such as ascribed too great an importance to a minute knowledge of the law, and who gladly gave themselves the appearance of being the most zealous observers of the law, 1 : 26, while they did not in any degree confirm and certify this professed pious disposition by their works; these persons the apostle exhorts to the strictest actual fulfilment of the law; 1 : 22—2 : 13. Comp. 3 : 13. Men who possessed such a hypocritical sanctity, must naturally find out food for their errors in Christianity. They saw in it only an institution which guided men to salvation by the revelation of divine truths; and they therefore believed, that in order to obtain the salvation promised by Christ, it was sufficient to confess those sublime truths externally, with the mouth only, and that real holiness of life was not essential. Hence they might frequently with vain self-complacency boast of their enlightened religious faith, without permitting it to exercise any influence over their life. It was in opposition to such, that James declared: Faith without works cannot save, for it is inactive and dead; 2 : 14—26.

Further, it is not to be wondered at, that persons who fancied they had acquired an accurate knowledge of these high revealed truths, should consider themselves as perfect Christians, and in their vanity assume to be teachers, in order to bring others also up to their supposed lofty point of Christian perfection—an error which is exposed by James in c. 3; comp. also 1 : 19.

What we must here particularly observe, is the declaration in 2 : 14—26, that man is justified by works and not by faith only; a declaration which, when considered in the specified connexion, must assuredly be acknowledged as correct. It is only the form and costume of the idea which give it even the appearance of contradicting Paul's doctrine. James might, indeed, have so arranged his discourse, as to show his readers in a strictly systematic deduction, by means of a definition of *faith*, that faith

without works did not merit the name, and that they had formed a totally erroneous idea of faith. But instead of this he chooses the much more practical and efficacious method, of not expressly correcting the false notion which his readers had of the word faith, but of accommodating himself to their mode of thinking, and only exhorting them, with reference to their peculiar conceptions, to take care that their faith was not destitute of works.

That Paul, moreover, in making justification dependent upon faith, did not mean a merely dead faith, but an active one; and that he thus makes justification to depend upon faith and works together, is clear from Rom. 2: 13 sq. and many passages in which he speaks of a faith working by love, as Gal. 5: 6. 1 Cor. 13: 2. 1 Thess. 1: 3. 2 Thess. 1: 3. Col. 1: 4. Eph. 1: 15. 3: 17. 4: 13, 15. 6: 23. On the other hand, James is far from upholding a justification by mere works, against which Paul warns so earnestly. He ascribes to *πίστις* likewise a share in justification—*οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον*, v. 24. He presses upon Christians the internal pious feeling, from which should spring the observance of the law, in calling Christianity, 1: 25, the more perfect law of liberty, in opposition to the Mosaic law which keeps men in the bondage of sin and guilt. He likewise declares the Mosaic law to fall short of justifying men, by saying that he who fails in one commandment fails in all, and no man can keep the whole law. He therefore requires men "to conduct as those who are judged by the law of liberty, i. e. who being sure of the forgiveness of their sins, have no longer to fear the condemnation of the law, so long as they persevere in a life of faith, and continue to possess true Christian feeling."¹

Lastly, it thus can also easily be shown, that there exists no discrepancy between the two apostles, in regard to the citation of the example of Abraham. The Jews prided themselves much on their descent from Abraham, by whom God had introduced circumcision, and to whom he had given the promises. They imagined, therefore, that, as descendants of Abraham, they became heirs of the promises through circumcision, one of the works of the law. In opposition to this idea, Paul asserts, that Abraham's merit consisted in the pious feeling of confidence in God from which his works sprang, and to prove this lays great stress on the expression *ἐν πίστει*, Gen. 15: 6. James, on the

¹ Neander, p. 35.

other hand, wishes to reprove his readers for boasting of their dead faith. He therefore directs their attention to Abraham, and shows them how it was reckoned to him for righteousness, that he acted, and performed the works of faith, under the guidance of pious feeling and confidence in God. He does not say that the faith of Abraham was useless towards his justification, but that his faith wrought in conjunction with his works, and on this account was a true and perfect faith; 2: 22. In a similar manner, in the passages above cited from Sirach and Maccabees, the favour of God enjoyed by Abraham is ascribed to the fact, that he kept the law and was found faithful in the hour of trial. It cannot, then, be remarkable that James should refer to a particular example of this nature, the offering up his son, Gen. c. 22, which it is true, took place after he had received the divine promise, Gen. 16: 5.

It is usual in investigating this subject to start the further question, Whence arose the misapprehension of James' readers—for a misapprehension must it ever be—which induced them to place the essence of Christianity in an external profession, and the external maintenance of a system of doctrines? This is a question to which we can hardly venture a decided reply, as only suppositions more or less probable can be made in regard to it. We must, however, for the sake of completeness, add a few words concerning it.

We have endeavoured to show above that a direct polemical reference to Paul on the part of James is wholly improbable. But this is not denying that there may have been an indirect controversy between the two apostles. For it is supposable that the Jewish Christians to whom James wrote, falsely apprehended the doctrine of Paul, and thus James controverts Paul, not as he understood him, but merely as his readers understood him. In this way we can easily account for the mutual agreement of the two apostles in their phraseology and turns of expression.—This is certainly possible in itself. James wrote to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, i. e. to all the Jewish Christians out of Palestine. The countries, however, in which the Jews were scattered, were chiefly Asia Minor, *διασπορὰ Ἀσίας*, 1 Pet. 1: 1, and the parts of Africa and Europe which might be called Grecian countries, *διασπορὰ Ἑλλήνων*, John 7: 35, with their

¹ So Hug in his Einleit. ins N. Test. p. 538. Th. II.

central point Alexandria. Now Asia Minor and Europe were the principal theatre of the apostolic labours of Paul, so that the greater portion of the dispersed Jews might have heard his preaching and might have misapprehended it.—Neander's objection, that in this case James should have given the true meaning of Paul's doctrine, in order not to seem to charge upon Paul himself the errors he was combating, may perhaps be obviated by supposing James to have treated the fact of a misapprehension of the doctrine of Paul among his readers, as a fact; without noticing and even without knowing its origin.

But it is certainly much more natural to suppose here a misapprehension of Christianity itself, which is seated deep in human nature and particularly in the carnal mode of thinking among the Jews; especially because, as Neander aptly observes, it is hardly to be imagined that Paul's doctrine in a misapprehended form should have been widely adopted, particularly among the Jewish Christians, among whom Paul's doctrines generally met least of all with a favourable reception. Such a depreciation of active Christianity would with much more probability have fallen in with an Antinomian tendency in the mind of the Gentiles; and such indeed appears sometimes to have been the fact; comp. Acts 21 : 21 sq.

The contents of the Epistle of James in general likewise favour this supposition. Were we desirous of forming, out of the particular traces we find in this Epistle, a definite picture of the condition of some individual christian church to which the whole of the Epistle was applicable, the attempt would hardly be successful. The Epistle has a wholly general character; the exhortations and warnings it contains are mostly general and unconnected, being arranged together without any perceptible points of transition. We cannot properly wonder at this general nature of the Epistle, inasmuch as James presupposes so large a class of persons to be the readers of it; 1 : 1. We cannot here expect instructions or warnings occasioned by special emergencies, but must anticipate that all the Epistle contained, would be of general application. Accordingly, we must not look in the passage under consideration, for any censure of a misapprehension of the doctrine of Paul, which could be charged against Jewish christians in any place; but for censure upon a misapprehension of christian principles in general, such as was everywhere possible from the predominant mode of thinking among the Jews as a people, and was perhaps actual in the

church at Jerusalem over which James presided. Indeed, this is a misapprehension which appears at all periods in the history of the christian church.

In every pious and uncorrupted mind there must exist a strong feeling of the need of atonement, and an ardent desire of reconciliation with God. Hence men have at all times, according to their ruder or more refined notions and impressions of religion, sought to satisfy this want. One principal reason why they have always so imperfectly attained their end, has lain in their carnal modes of thinking; in consequence of which they could not elevate themselves in spirit to what was exalted and divine, but drew this down to the level of the low and sensual. Such were the Jews, particularly at the time when Christianity appeared in the world. Confounding internal with external religion, the spirit with the letter, they sought after a dead external holiness of works; by which, as by an *opus operatum*, they thought to merit justification before God. Such an external holiness of works always has its source in a dead faith, which regards the law to be observed as a divine precept, and thinks by fulfilling it, that is by external works not springing from the heart, to acquire the favour of God. With this idea men were easily led to add to the divine law a multitude of human institutes and precepts, by the observance of which they thought to enhance still more their merit before God. As this faith was thus considered an essential part of religion, (or religiousness,) by steadfast adherence to it a rigid *orthodoxy* was attained, which however had to do, not with the spirit which maketh alive, but with the letter which killeth. This religious tendency was represented among the Jews by the PHARISEES.—Christianity now appeared and taught men that all these carnal and external exercises were vain and useless, and that it was only by the spirit, by an internal pious disposition, by a humble, confiding, entire surrender to Christ, which, however, must always influence the conduct and sanctify the life—that it was only by this genuine christian principle of life, that man could obtain reconciliation with God through divine grace. The first who comprehended this truth in all its strictness was the apostle Paul. To denote this new thing, this new christian principle of life as a spiritual means of justification, Christianity introduced likewise a new technical word, *πίστις*, which, as is the case with our word *faith*, but half expresses the idea it is intended to designate; and therefore necessarily gave rise very early to numerous misconstructions.

Some saw nothing new in Christianity at all incompatible with Judaism, inasmuch as they were acquainted with something falsely called *πλοῦς*; and hence they were desirous of retaining the *νόμος*, to which they attached the highest value. It was these in particular whom Paul combated. Others acknowledged that Christ, the divine messenger, had brought life and salvation to men in the Gospel; but they either contented themselves with this acknowledgment,¹ or regarded the moral precepts of Christ as a new *νόμος* for which they had exchanged the Mosaic law. Both classes erred in regarding the *πλοῦς*, or rigid orthodoxy, and the *ἔργα*, or mere external works, each separately as an *opus operatum*, which led to salvation; without recognizing both in their necessary mutual relation. Thus we find always in the ancient church, along with the strictest adherence to the doctrines of the church, the slightest deviation from which was heresy, a tendency likewise to hypocritical works of holiness, in which it was taken for granted that by a voluntary worship, by the observance of certain human institutes and customs, it was possible in the sight of God to merit forgiveness of sins. It was the reaction against this last tendency, that was the immediate occasion of the great Reformation of the church, which restored to its proper place the doctrine of *justification by faith*. Still this doctrine did not remain free from misconstruction; so that e. g. there arose a merely verbal controversy, founded simply on misapprehension; for the declaration of Amsdorf in the heat of controversy, that "good works are prejudicial to salvation," when rightly understood, is just as true, as Major's position "that they are essential to salvation," is untrue, if incorrectly understood. Thus even yet the idea of *πλοῦς* was far from being accurately comprehended or defined in itself, much less as to its true relation to christian life; it was only partially considered, and the efforts of theologians were directed by preference to the illustration and support of the dogma according to the very letter of Luther. It was therefore high time, when the pious Spener again brought back Christianity, which seemed on the point of being dissipated in speculation and a spirit of dogmatic discussion, to firm ground, by bringing it again to act upon the life of man. Still, however, even in our time, that unity of faith and works, in which alone

¹ Like those against whom James speaks in the passage under consideration.

the true christian *πίστις* consists, is not yet found throughout the christian world; and there remains to us only the hope, that it will one day thus appear, when, in conformity with the promise of our Lord, there shall be *one fold and one Shepherd*.

ART. IV. ON THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS RESPECTING CHRIST.

By C. G. Bretschneider. Translated by the Editor.*

Two passages are found in the writings of Josephus, in which he speaks of Jesus Christ; one of which, being of considerable length, is called by way of eminence, *The Testimony of Josephus respecting CHRIST*, and has given rise to many disputes among learned men. The following are the passages in question.

ΑΝΤΙQ. XVIII. 3. 3. *Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἄνθρωπος, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρηΐ ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἐργῶν ποιητὴς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τάληθῇ δεχομένων· καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἷγε πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Εἰς ἔτι νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον.*

* The following tract by Bretschneider, appears to be so conclusive in regard to a very important historical question, that it cannot but be acceptable to the readers of the Biblical Repository to have a translation of it preserved in these pages. The tract appears as an appendix to the little work: *Capita Theologiae Judæorum dogmaticæ e Flavii Josephi scriptis collecta, auctore C. G. BRETSCHNEIDER, Theol. Doct. etc. Lips. 1812.*—ED.

ΑΝΤΙΩ. XX. 9. 1. (Ἀνάως) καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν, καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τινὰς ἑτέρους, ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος, παρέδωκε λυσσθῆσομένους.

"At this time lived Jesus, a wise man; if indeed it be proper to call him a man. For he performed astonishing works, and was a teacher of such as delight in receiving the truth; and drew to himself many of the Jews, and many also of the Gentiles. This was he who is [called] Christ. And when Pilate, at the instance of the chief men among us, had caused him to be crucified, still those who had once loved him, did not cease to love him. For on the third day he again appeared unto them alive; divine prophets having foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things respecting him. And even to this day, that class of persons who were called from him CHRISTIANS, have not become extinct."

"Ananus assembled a council of judges, and having brought before them the brother of Jesus, called Christ (whose own name was James,) and certain others, and having accused them of violating the laws, he delivered them over to be stoned."

The great dispute has been whether the former of these passages be genuine or not. Many learned men have supposed, that some christian transcriber, out of a pious regard for the interests of Christianity, and in order to afford an argument against the unbelieving Jews, inserted the whole passage; or that at least, if Josephus did make any mention of Christ, much of the language, as it now stands, has been thus interpolated.¹ Although it is not my intention to decide upon this controversy, nor to repeat all that has been urged on both sides of the question; yet I have thought that it might be neither uninteresting nor useless to suggest very briefly some things on this subject, which seem to me not to have received sufficient consideration.² The passage in question may indeed well cause the reader to hesitate; but if all the circumstances be duly weighed, I do not apprehend that it can be considered either as spurious, or as

¹ See Leos Progr. I, II, super Josephi de Christo testimonio, Goett. 1781. Henke Geschichte der christ. Kirche. 1 Th. p. 54 sq.

² For a long and learned defence of this passage, see Hauteville Erwiesene Wahrheit der christ. Relig. 1745. p. 275-311.

having suffered any change from the hands of christian transcribers.

I. If we were to decide the question by the authority of manuscripts, there can be no doubt but that the passage was written by Josephus, and has never been corrupted. All the manuscripts which are known, exhibit the same words, in the same place and order; and they are also quoted, first by Eusebius, and afterwards by Jerome, Suidas, and others. But if all the manuscripts uniformly agree, and we have, besides, testimonies of great antiquity to the genuineness of the passage, it surely cannot justly be called in question, except upon the strength of very weighty arguments. What then are those arguments? They are drawn partly from the silence of certain writers, and partly from the character of the passage itself.

1. The most ancient christian writers, it is said, and especially Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen, have never employed this passage against the Jews; which they certainly would have done, had it been then extant. But from the mere silence of a few writers in a case of this kind, can we draw any certain conclusion which shall overturn the credit of all the manuscripts? No one will affirm this.¹ But Origen has expressly said, *κατανοεῖ ἀνιστῶν* [*ἰωσήφης*] *τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡς Χριστῷ*, *Josephus did not believe on Jesus as the Messiah*; ² and again, *Ἰησοῦν ἡμῶν οὐ καταδεχόμενος εἶναι Χριστόν*, *he did not receive our Jesus as the Messiah*.³ Origen therefore, it is said, could not have known of the passage in question, in which Josephus certainly acknowledges Jesus as the Messiah; and hence it is manifest that the manuscripts of Josephus in the time of Origen, (who died A. D. 254,) could not have contained those words. On the other hand, others have very justly suggested, that Origen means only to affirm, that *Josephus did not become a follower of Christ*. But passing over this suggestion, we find that between the death of Origen and the time of Eusebius, there was an interval of only fifty years. Is it possible that in so short a time, all the manuscripts, or even many of them, should have been thus interpolated? Can we suppose that Eusebius was hurried on against the Jews by a zeal so blind, that although he does not seek to conceal the doubts which were raised respecting the sacred

¹ For many reasons why they should not have quoted this passage, see Hauteville, l. c. p. 283 sq.

² Lib. I. c. Cels.

³ Comm. in Matt.

books of the Scriptures, he should yet publish this passage as genuine and true, though he knew it was wanting in many manuscripts, or was written only in the margin? Is it credible, moreover, that this interpolation, which was unknown to Origen, should have immediately crept into all the manuscripts; so that neither Jerome, nor Sozomen, nor Suidas, nor any other early writer, should have stumbled upon a manuscript in which it was not contained?

2. It is objected further, that by this testimony respecting Jesus, the order of the narrative is interrupted; but if this be taken away, the proper order will be restored. The circumstances are just these: In c. 3. § 1, Josephus relates that Pilate introduced images of Cæsar into Jerusalem; but that when a tumult had been excited on account of them, he ordered them to be removed. In § 2, Pilate attempted to bring water into Jerusalem, at the expense of the temple, etc. and in a tumult which arises, he puts to death many of the Jews. In § 3, he crucifies Jesus who is called Christ, a wise and holy man. In § 4, it is narrated that another evil (*ἕτερον δέινον*) occasioned trouble to the Jews, viz. a flagitious crime committed in the temple of Isis at Rome; as connected with which, § 5 relates that all the Jews were banished by Tiberius from Rome. The writer then goes on, in c. 4, to describe the sedition of the Samaritans, and the suppression of it by Pilate. Now can any one justly affirm that the history of Josephus is in any way interrupted by the passage in question? Can any one show what connexion would be restored, if this were omitted? Most evidently Josephus has narrated the events in the order in which they occurred, and intended to give them no other connexion than that of succession of time. If therefore it was his purpose to make any mention of the fate of Jesus, he could have done it with propriety in no other place.

3. Another, and a more plausible objection is, that it is impossible to suppose that Josephus would speak of Jesus in this manner, and acknowledge him as the Messiah, and yet not have embraced his religion, and become a Christian. But this objection seems to be grounded on a misapprehension of the language of Josephus; for *Χριστός* is here not a doctrinal appellation, but merely a proper name, and is to be translated, not *the Christ*, i. e. the Messiah, but simply *Christ*. '*Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν*, i. e. *οὗτος ἦν ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*, as it is read in the other passage, *this was he who is known by the name of Christ*,

and whose followers are still called from him, *Christians*. It is likewise to be remembered, that Josephus was writing not to Jews, but to Greeks, who were unacquainted with the doctrinal meaning of ὁ Χριστός among the former people. He therefore undoubtedly wrote the words ὁ Χριστός οὗτος ἦν, to signify to the Greeks, that the Jesus of whom he was speaking, was the same person of whom they had heard so much, under the name of *Christ*; and that the name of *Christians*, which was then well known to the Greeks, was derived from the surname of the same Jesus. And because he would assign a reason, why the disciples of Jesus adhered to him so strongly after his crucifixion, he states that Jesus after his death appeared again to his followers alive, and that many prophecies were accomplished in him. Josephus therefore does not say this as expressing his own belief, for he had never known Jesus; but he describes in these words the belief of the Christians, the credibility of which he either did not wish, or was unable to impugn. It should moreover be borne in mind, that Josephus appears not to have adopted the notions respecting the Messiah, which were current among the Jews; nor yet to have exhibited any higher views or hopes respecting any Saviour. If then he did actually esteem Jesus as a σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, as he calls him, whose deeds and fate were remarkable and unusual, he would yet, merely in this view, have no reason for changing his religion.

All the arguments, then, which are urged against the passage under consideration, even if we allow them their fullest force, are yet uncertain; and surely they are not of sufficient weight, to weaken the credit of all the manuscripts and so many of the early fathers; much less to destroy it.

Nor indeed does the opinion, that the passage was inserted by some christian transcriber, in itself considered, carry with it much appearance of truth. A transcriber of this sort would hardly have been contented with the language as it now stands; he would have introduced more facts respecting the life of Jesus; he would have dwelt with more prolixity on all the circumstances; and would have noted more particularly his innocence, his resurrection from the dead, his ascension into heaven. We have but to glance at the spurious narratives which were manufactured in the second and third centuries, to rest satisfied that a writer of this sort would not have restrained himself to expressions so moderate as σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρητὰ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητῆς καὶ ἀνθρώπων διδάσκαλος, a wise man,

if it be proper to call him a man; a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of men. What unheard of moderation in a writer, desirous of palming upon the world a pious fraud! Can we for a moment suppose that such a writer would merely have said *ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν*? or that he would not have more accurately described *οἱ πρῶτοι ἄνδρες παρ' ἡμῖν*, those chief men among the Jews, or *οἱ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες*, those who loved him from the first?

II. It was manifestly the object of Josephus, to comprise in his narrative all that was memorable in the history of his nation. Is it then probable that he should not have said a word respecting the origin of the order of Christians, who at that time had become numerous even among the Greeks? Why, I ask, should he adopt such a course? Perhaps through hatred of the Christians, like the rest of his countrymen. This, however, no one will believe, who has read the writings of Josephus; he will not even suspect it. Or perhaps it was through fear of the Jews, lest by narrating the truth, he should give them offence and excite their hatred. If such had been his fear, he ought not to have written at all; much less to have depicted as he has done the perverse obstinacy and depravity of his countrymen. How then can we suppose it possible, that a writer like Josephus, of real diligence, who had treated with considerable copiousness of the life and death of John the Baptist,¹ how, I say, can we suppose it possible that he should pass over in entire silence a person so remarkable as Jesus, and not bestow a single word on the origin of the sect called Christians, a name which already had become common and well known? Yet unless this passage be genuine, there is no place in the writings of Josephus, where he speaks of the life or character of Christ; and this affords a ground of persuasion in favour of its genuineness.

III. This persuasion is confirmed by the other passage quoted at the head of this article, where mention is made of the death of the brother of Jesus, *ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*. In this latter passage I cannot help believing that Josephus refers to what he had before related respecting this same Jesus. For when he wishes to explain who this James was, who was unknown to Greek readers, he does not call him by his proper name, but gives him the title of *the brother of Jesus who is called Christ*. Josephus has therefore made use of that which was common and well

¹ Antiq. XVIII. 5. 2.

known, in order to explain and describe what was unknown. Suppose now that he had not previously spoken of that Jesus, but had passed over his life and fortunes in silence; how then could he now simply say, *Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*, *Jesus who is called Christ*? I can see no reason to doubt that Josephus took it for granted, that his readers knew and remembered, from what he had already said, who this Jesus was, that was surnamed Christ. For who would suppose that a writer like Josephus would narrate the circumstances of the death of James, a person of far less celebrity, and yet be silent in respect to Jesus? Or who would not deem it a mark of weakness in a writer, that in order more definitely to describe an unknown man, he should introduce the name of another person, whom, although possessed of the highest claims to notice, he had every where else passed over without the slightest mention?

ART. V. NOTES ON THE BEDOUINS.

From Burekhardt.*

The following sketches relate especially to the Aenezes; these are the only true Bedouin nation of Syria, while the other Arab tribes in the neighbourhood of this country have, more or less, degenerated in manners: several being reduced to subjection, while the free-born Aeneze is still governed by the same laws that spread over the desert at the beginning of the Moham-medan era.

* "Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys," Lond. 1830, quarto. Very few copies of this work have reached this country; and as it contains the collected fruits of the author's long residence and journeyings among the Arabs of the desert, all of which are highly illustrative of the nomadic life and manners so often referred to in the Old Testament, we have thought we could not better subserve the interests of biblical learning, than by transferring copious extracts to our pages.—Ed.

I. MODE OF ENCAMPING.

In countries where security reigns, the Bedouins often encamp the whole year round, occupying but two or three tents together, at the distance of several hours from any other members of their tribe. I have seen such solitary inhabitants of the Hodeyl tribe in the mountains east of Mekka, and some of the Sowaleha and Mezeiyne tribes in the mountains of Sinai.

It may be here remarked that all the wealthy Bedouins have two sets of tent-coverings—one new and strong, for winter—the other old and light, for summer.

On the Syrian and Arabian plains the Bedouins encamp in summer (when rainwater cannot be found in pools), near wells, where they remain often for a whole month; while their flocks and herds pasture all around, at the distance of several hours, under the guard of slaves or shepherds, who bring them every second or third day to the well for water. It is on these occasions that the Arabs make attacks upon other tribes; for it becomes known that such or such people are encamped near a certain well, and may be easily surprised. If an attack of this kind be apprehended, the men of the encampment are in constant readiness for defence, and for the rescue of their cattle, which the enemy often strives to carry off. The Sherarat Arabs, who, living on the Syrian Hadj route, are much exposed to invasion, constantly have a saddled camel before their tents, that they may the more readily hasten to the assistance of their shepherds. Most wells in the interior of the deserts, and especially in Nedjd, are exclusive property, either of a whole tribe, or of individuals whose ancestors dug the wells. During the Wahaby government many new wells have been made by the chief's order. If a well be the property of a tribe, the tents are pitched near it, whenever rain-water becomes scarce in the desert; and no other Arabs are then permitted to water their camels there. But if the well belongs to an individual, he repairs it in summer time, accompanied by his tribe, and receives presents from all strange tribes who pass or encamp at the well, and refresh their camels with the water of it; and these presents are particularly required if a party pass on its return home, which has been seen taking plunder from an enemy. The property of such a well is never alienated; and the Arabs say, that the possessor is sure to be fortunate, as all who drink of the water be-

stow on him their benedictions.* In spring and winter it is more difficult to carry off the cattle, because in those seasons they find sufficient food close to the tents, and are, therefore, easily protected. There are tribes which encamp in spring time far from any streams or wells, on fertile plains, where they remain for several weeks without tasting water, living wholly upon milk; and their cattle can dispense with water as long as green and juicy herbage affords them nourishment: this, however, is not the case with horses. Considerable numbers of the Beni Shammar thus encamp every spring, for upwards of a month, in the waterless desert between Djof and Djebel Shammar.

In travelling, strong parties only can venture to encamp at night near a well, where they may naturally expect visitors. Weaker parties water their beasts, fill their water-skins, and encamp at a distance from any road leading to the well.

The Aenezes are nomades in the strictest acceptation of the word, for they continue during the whole year in almost constant motion. Their summer quarters are near the Syrian frontiers, and in winter they retire into the heart of the desert, or towards the Euphrates. In summer they encamp close to rivolets and springs which abound near the Syrian desert, but they seldom remain above three or four days in the same spot: as soon as their cattle have consumed the herbage near a watering-place, the tribe removes in search of pasture, and the grass again springing up serves for a succeeding camp. The encampments vary in number of tents, from ten to eight hundred: when the tents are but few, they are pitched in a circle, and then called *dowâr*; but more considerable numbers in a straight line, or a row of single tents, especially along a rivulet, sometimes three or four behind as many others. Such encampments are called *nezel*. In winter, when water and pasture never fail, the mode of encamping is different. The whole tribe then spreads itself over the plain in parties of three or four tents each, with an interval of half an hour's distance between each party: to encamp thus, is called *fereik*. In the *dowâr*, as in the *nezel*, the sheikh's or chief's tent is always on the western side; for it is from the west, that the Syrian Arabs expect their enemies as well as their guests. To oppose the former, and to honour the latter, is the sheikh's principal business; and as it is

* Compare Genesis 21: 25 sq. 26: 15 sq.—ED.

usual for a guest to alight at the first tent that presents itself in the camp, the sheikh's ought to be on the side from which most strangers arrive: it is even disgraceful that a wealthy man should pitch his tent on the eastern side.

Every father of a family sticks his lance into the ground by the side of his tent, and in front ties his horse or mare (should he possess one); there also his camels repose at night. The sheep and goats remain day and night under a shepherd's care, who every evening drives them home.

When I was returning from Tedmor towards Damascus, I met, on the same day, two strong encampments moving slowly over the sandy plain in search of water and pasture: their order of march was as follows. A party of five or six horsemen preceded the tribe about four miles, as a reconnoitering detachment (or *sulf*): the main body occupied a line of at least three miles in front. First came some armed horsemen and camel-riders, at a hundred or a hundred and fifty paces from each other, extending along the whole front; then followed the she-camels with their young ones, grazing in wide ranks during their march upon the wild herbage: behind walked the camels loaded with the tents and provisions; and the last were the women and children, mounted on camels having saddles made in the shape of a cradle, with curtains to screen them from the sun. The men indiscriminately rode along and amidst the whole body, but most of them in front of the line; some led horses by their halters: in depth their wandering bodies extended about two miles and a half. I had seen them encamped when on my way to Tedmor, and then estimated one at about two hundred, and the other at two hundred and fifty tents; the latter had above three thousand camels. Of all the Arabs I did not see one on foot, except a few shepherds, who drove the sheep and goats, about a mile behind the main body.

II. FOOD AND COOKERY.

The principal Bedouin dishes are,

Fitta.—Unleavened paste of flour and water, baked in ashes of camel's dung, and mixed up afterwards with a little butter; when the whole is thoroughly kneaded, they serve it up in a bowl of wood or leather. If milk be mixed with the *fitta*, the mixture is called *khāfoury*.

Ayesh.—Flour and sour camel's milk, made into a paste, and

boiled: the camel's milk becomes sourish soon after it is put into the *zeka*, or goat-skin.

Behatta.—Rice or flour, boiled with sweet camel's milk.

Heneyne.—Bread, butter, and dates, blended together into a paste.

Khubz.—Bread; more commonly called in the Bedouin dialect *jisre*. It is of two sorts, both unleavened, one of which is baked in round cakes upon a plate of iron (*sádj*), as among the Syrian Fellahs: the other mode of making bread is, by spreading out in a circle a great number of small stones, over which a brisk fire is kindled; when the stones are sufficiently heated, the fire is removed, and the paste spread over the hot stones, and immediately covered with glowing ashes, and left until thoroughly baked. This bread is only used at breakfast, and is called *khubz aly el redháf*.

Burgoul.—Wheat, boiled with some leaven, and then dried in the sun. This dried wheat is preserved for a year, and, boiled with butter or oil, is the common dish with all classes in Syria.

Butter is made in the following manner. The goat's or sheep's milk (for camel's milk is never used for this purpose) is put into the *keder*, over a slow fire, and a little leben or sour milk, or a small piece of the dried entrails of a young lamb (*metefkhá*), thrown in with it: the milk then separates, and is put into the goat-skin, called *zeka*, which is tied to one of the tent poles, and for one or two hours constantly moved backwards and forwards: the buttery substance then coagulates, the water is squeezed out, and the butter put into the skin, called *mekrash*: if after two days they have collected a certain quantity of butter, they again place it over the fire, throw a handful of *burgoul* into it, and leave it to boil, taking care to skim it. After having boiled for some time, the *burgoul* precipitates all the foreign substances, and the butter remains quite clear at the top of the *keder*. The butter-milk is once more drained through a bag of camel's hair, and whatever remains in it of a butter-like substance is left to dry in the sun; and thus eaten it is called *auket*, or *hameid jebsheb*. The *burgoul*, cleared of the butter with which it was boiled, is called *kheláse*, and eaten by children. There are Aeneze tribes in the Nedjd, who seldom or never taste meat, but live almost wholly on dates and milk. Having taken off the butter, they beat the butter-milk again till it coagulates, and then dry it till it becomes quite hard; they

then grind it; and each family collects in spring two or three loads of it. They eat it mixed with butter.

The Aenezes do not make any cheese, at least very seldom, but convert all the milk of their sheep and goats into butter. The Arabs of Abl el Shemál, on the contrary, furnish cheese to most of the inhabitants of the Eastern Syrian plain.

Kemmáye, or *kemmá*, (or in the Bedouin dialect *djeme*), a favourite dish of the Arabs, is a kind of truffle growing in the desert, without any appearance of either roots or seeds; in size and shape the *kemmáye* much resembles the true truffle. There are three species of it: the red, *khelásy*, the black, *jebah*, and the white, *zebeidy*. If the rain has been abundant during winter, the *djemes* are found in the end of March. They lie about four inches under ground: the place where they grow is known by a little rising of the ground over them. If the fruit is left to attain full maturity, it rises above the earth to about half its volume. The children and servants dig it out with short sticks. They are sometimes so numerous on the plain that the camels stumble over them. Each family then gathers four or five camel-loads; and while this stock lasts, they live exclusively on *kemmáye*, without tasting either burgoul or ayesh. The *kemmáyes* are boiled in water or milk till they form a paste, over which melted butter is poured: they are sometimes roasted and eaten with melted butter. It is said that they produce eotiveness. If they have been abundant, they are dried in the sun, and afterwards dressed for use like fresh ones. Great quantities are consumed by the people of Damascus, and the peasants of Eastern Syria. In general they are worth at Damascus about a halfpenny per pound. They are brought to Damascus from the district near *Tel Zeykal* on the eastern limits of the *Merdy*. To Aleppo they are brought from the plain adjoining Djebel el Hass. Camels do not eat *kemmáye*. The desert *Hammad*, or the great plain between Damascus and Baghdad and Basrah, is full of *kemmáye*.

The Aeneze eat gazelles, whenever they can kill them. I heard that they regard the *jerboa*, or rat of the desert, as a great dainty, for its fine flavour. The interior of the desert abounds with jerboas.

The *ayesh* is the daily and universal dish of the Aenezes; and even the richest sheikh would think it a shame to order his wife to dress any other dish, merely to please his own palate. The Arabs never indulge in luxuries, but on occasion of some festi-

val, or on the arrival of a stranger. For a common guest, bread is baked, and served up with the ayesh; if the guest is of some consideration, coffee is prepared for him, and *behatta*, or *fitta*, or bread with melted butter. For a man of rank, a kid or lamb is killed. When this occurs, they boil the lamb with burgoul and camel's milk, and serve it up in a large wooden dish, round the edge of which the meat is placed. A wooden bowl, containing the melted grease of the animal, is put and pressed down in the midst of the burgoul; and every morsel is dipped into the grease before it is swallowed. If a camel should be killed, (which rarely happens,) it is cut into large pieces; some part is boiled, and its grease mixed with burgoul; part is roasted, and, like the boiled, put upon the dish of burgoul. The whole tribe then partakes of the delicious feast. Camel's flesh is more esteemed in winter than in summer; and the she-camel more than the male. The grease of the camel is kept in goat-skins, and used like butter.

Throughout the desert there is a great sameness in the Bedouin dishes; for they every where consist chiefly of flour and butter. In every province, however, different names are given to the same dish; thus what the Aenezes call *fitta*, the Arabs of Sinai denominate *medjelleh*, or, if milk be mixed with it, *marekeda*. The *djereisha* is a very common dish in the interior of the desert, boiled wheat which has been coarsely ground, and over which butter is poured; with the addition of milk it becomes *nekaa*. The custom of telling the landlord to take away the meat for the women, is prevalent among the Sinai Arabs, although not known in Hedjaz. In such parts of the desert as are far distant from any cultivated districts, the consumption of corn is much less than in others. Thus the Arabs on the eastern coast of the Red Sea, between Yembo and Akaba, use but little wheaten bread. It is the want of corn that obliges all Bedouins to keep up any intercourse with those who cultivate the soil; and it is a mistake to imagine that the Bedouins can ever be independent of the cultivators. The frontier villages of Syria and Mesopotamia, the towns of Nedjd; Yembo, Mekka, and Djidda, and the cultivated vallies of Hedjaz and Yemen, are frequented for provisions by all the Bedouins at a distance of ten or fifteen days from those points: there they sell their cattle, and take in return wheat, barley and clothes. It is only when circumstances force them, that Arabs content themselves with a diet of milk and meat alone.

Of camel's milk, neither butter nor cheese is ever made ; it abounds among the Aenezes. The sheep and goats are milked every morning by the women before day-break ; the milk is shaken for about two hours in skins, and thus becomes butter ; and the buttermilk constitutes the chief beverage of the Arabs, and is much used in their dishes : it is generally (but not always) called *leben*, while fresh milk is distinguished by the term, *kaleib*.

A lamb is sometimes roasted or baked in the earth ; a hole being made for that purpose, heated and covered with stones. Many Bedouins have a custom of boiling certain herbs in butter, which is then poured off into the skins containing their provisions. This butter becomes strongly impregnated with the odour of those herbs, and is much liked by the Arabs. The herb *shyk* is often used in this manner ; the herb *baiherân* (a species of thyme) is commonly applied to this purpose in Nedjd.

On their journeys, the Bedouins live almost wholly upon unleavened bread baked in the ashes, and mixed with butter : this food they call *kurs*, *ayesh*, and *kahkeh*.

I have elsewhere remarked that the Arabs of Kerek regard it as extremely shameful to sell any butter. Among the Bedouins near Mekka to sell milk is considered as equally degrading, and the poorest Arab would not expose himself to the opprobrious nickname of *lebbân*, or "milk-seller," although, during the pilgrimage, milk is excessively dear. It forms a curious exception to this rule, that the Beni Koreish, who esteem themselves the most noble race of Arabian Bedouins, freely sell their milk, with which Mekka is supplied from the tents of that tribe, generally pitched about Djebel Arafat and Wady Muna.

In Hedjaz the usual dish of the Arabs is Indian rice, mixed with lentils and without any bread ; this they find cheaper than corn, and equally nutritious ; but wherever dates grow, that excellent fruit constitutes their chief diet. In Nedjd, Hedjaz, and Yemen, the Bedouins use butter to excess. Whoever can afford such luxury, swallows every morning a large cupfull of butter before breakfast, and snuffs up as much into his nostrils (this is also a favourite practice among the people of Mekka) : all their food swims in butter. The continual motion and exercise in which they employ themselves strengthen their powers of digestion, and for the same reason, an Arab will live for months together upon the smallest allowance ; and then, if an opportu-

nity should offer, he will devour at one sitting the flesh of half a lamb without any injury to his health.

In the interior of their deserts, the Bedouins never make any cheese; their butter is made of sheep's or goats' milk. I have never seen any butter made from the milk of camels, although I understood that this was sometimes the case on particular occasions of necessity; many Arabs with whom I conversed had never tasted any.

Throughout the desert when a sheep or goat is killed, the persons present often eat the liver and kidneys raw, adding to it a little salt. Some Arabs of Yemen are said to eat raw not only those parts, but likewise whole slices of flesh; thus resembling the Abyssinians and the Druses of Libanon, who frequently indulge in raw meat, the latter to my own certain knowledge. The Asyr Arabs, and those south of them towards Yemen, eat horse flesh; but this is never used as food among the northern Bedouins.

The Arabs are rather slovenly in their manner of eating; they thrust the whole hand into the dish before them, shape the burgoul into balls as large as a hen's egg, and thus swallow it. They wash their hands just before dinner, but seldom after; being content to lick the grease off their fingers, and rub their hands upon the leather scabbards of their swords, or clean them with the *roffe* of the tent (as above mentioned). The common hour of breakfast is about ten o'clock: dinner or supper is served at sunset. If there is plenty of pasture, camel's milk is handed round after dinner. The Arabs eat heartily, and with much eagerness. The boiled dish set before them being always very hot, it requires some practice to avoid burning one's fingers, and yet to keep pace with the voracious company. Indeed, during my first acquaintance with the Arabs, I seldom retired from a meal quite satisfied. Among the Arabs of the desert, as those of the towns, the disgusting custom of eructation after every meal is universal. This I observe, to correct a misrepresentation of D'Arvieux.

The women eat in the *meharrem* what is left of the men's dinner: they seldom have the good fortune to taste any meat except the head, feet, and liver of the lambs. While the men of the camp resort to the tent in which a stranger is entertained, and participate in the supper, their women steal into the *meharrem* of the hostess, to beg a foot, or some other trifling portion of the animal killed for the occasion.

III. INDUSTRY.

The chief specimens of Bedouin industry are the tanning of leather; the preparing of water-skins, the weaving of tents, sacks, cloaks, and *abbas*. The leather is tanned by means of pomegranate juice, or, (as more commonly over the whole desert) with the *gharad* or fruit of the *Sant*, or else with the bark of the *Seyale*, another mimosa species. The women sew the water-skins which the men have tanned. They work in Hedjaz very neat neck-leathers for the camels, upon which their husbands ride; these are a kind of net-work, adorned with shells and leather tassels, called *dawireh*. The distaff is frequently seen in the hands of men all over the Hedjaz; and it seems strange that they should not regard this as derogating from their masculine dignity, while they disdainfully spurn at every other domestic employment. Among all the Bedouin tribes, goat's hair constitutes the material of the coverings of tents, and of camel and provision bags.

IV. WEALTH AND PROPERTY OF THE BEDOUINS.

An Arab's property consists almost wholly in his horses and camels. The profits arising from his butter enable him to procure the necessary provisions of wheat and barley, and occasionally a new suit of clothes for his wife and daughters. His mare every spring produces a valuable colt, and by her means he may expect to enrich himself with booty. No Arab family can exist without one camel at least; a man, who has but ten, is reckoned poor: thirty or forty place a man in easy circumstances; and he who possesses sixty, is rich. I do not, however, make this statement as applicable to all Arabs: there are tribes originally poor, like the *Ahl Djebel* Arabs; among whom, from the possession of ten camels, a man is reckoned wealthy. Some sheikhs of the Aenezes have as many as three hundred camels. The sheikh who was my guide to Tedmor was reputed to have one hundred camels, between three and four hundred sheep and goats, two mares and one horse. The price of a camel varies according to the demands of the Hadj or Mekka caravans. The Hadj not having taken place for the last four years, a good Arab camel is now worth about ten pounds. I once inquired of an Arab in easy circumstances, what was the amount of his yearly expenditure; and he said, that in ordinary years he consumed—

	plastres.
Four camel-loads of wheat	200
Barley for his mare	100
Clothing for his women and children	200
Luxuries, as coffee, <i>kammerdin</i> , <i>debs</i> ,* tobacco, and half a dozen lambs	200
	<hr/> 700

about 35 or 40 pounds sterling.

Among the Arabs, horses are not so numerous as might be supposed from the reports of several travellers, as well as of the country people in Syria, who indeed are but imperfectly acquainted with the affairs of the Desert. During my visits to Aeneze encampments, I could seldom reckon more than one mare for six or seven tents. The Aenezes exclusively ride their mares, and sell the male colts to the peasants and town's people of Syria and Baghidad. The Arabs of Ahl el Shemál have more horses than the Aenezes, but the breed is adulterated in some instances.

Wealth, however, among the Arabs is extremely precarious, and the most rapid changes of fortune are daily experienced. The bold incursions of robbers, and sudden attacks of hostile parties, reduce, in a few days, the richest man to a state of beggary; and we may venture to say, that there are not many fathers of families who have escaped such disasters. The detail hereafter given, of Bedouin wars and robberies, will explain this assertion. It may be almost said, that the Arabs are obliged to rob and pillage. Most families of the Aenezes are unable to defray the annual expenses from their profits on their cattle, and few Arabs would sell a camel to purchase provisions: he knows, from experience, that to continue long in a state of peace, diminishes the wealth of an individual; war and plunder therefore becomes necessary. The sheikh is obliged to lead his Arabs against the enemy, if there be one; if not, it can easily be contrived to make one. But it may be truly said, that wealth alone does not give a Bedouin any importance among his people. A poor man, if he be hospitable and liberal according to his means, always killing a lamb when a stranger arrives, giving coffee to all the guests present, holding his bag of tobacco

* *Kammerdin*, dried apricot jelly from Damascus.—*Debs*, a sweet jelly made of grapes.

always ready to supply the pipes of his friends, and sharing whatever booty he gets among his poor relations, sacrificing his last penny to honour his guest or relieve those who want, obtains infinitely more consideration and influence among his tribe, than the *bakheil*, or avaricious and wealthy miser, who receives a guest with coldness, and lets his poor friends starve. As riches among this nation of robbers do not confer influence or power, so the wealthy person does not derive from them any more refined gratification than the poorest individual of the tribe may enjoy. The richest sheikh lives like the meanest of his Arabs: they both eat every day of the same dishes, and in the same quantity, and never partake of any luxury unless on the arrival of a stranger, when the host's tent is open to all his friends. They both dress in the same kind of shabby gown and *messhlakh*. The chief pleasure in which the chief may indulge, is the possession of a swift mare, and the gratification of seeing his wife and daughters better dressed than the other females of the camp.

Bankruptcy, in the usual acceptance of the word, is unknown among the Arabs. A Bedouin either loses his property by the enemy (it is then said of him *wukhad helâle*), or he expends it in profuse hospitality. In this latter case he is praised by the whole tribe; and as the generous Arab is most frequently endowed with other nomadic virtues, he seldom fails to regain, by some lucky stroke, what he had so nobly lost.

The only Bedouins that can be reckoned wealthy, are those whose tribes pasture their cattle in the open plains, which have been fertilized by the rains of winter. To them belong innumerable herds of camels: the richest Bedouins of the southern plains are the *Kahtan* tribe, on the frontiers of Yemen. The father of a family is said to be poor among them, if he possess only forty camels; the usual stock in a family is from one hundred to two hundred. The tribes of poor Bedouins are all those who occupy a mountainous territory, where the camels find less food, and are not so prolific. Thus the Bedouin inhabitants of that whole chain of mountains, that extend from Damascus across Arabia Petræa, and along the coast of the Red Sea, as far as Yemen, are all people of little property in cattle, while all the tribes of the eastern plains possess great numbers. The account which I have already given of an Arab's yearly expenses, must be understood only of a man above the common class; many respectable families spend only half that

sum. To give a specimen of the means adopted by a poor Arab to gain his livelihood, and furnish his family with provisions, my journal of an expedition in the Sinai mountains may be consulted. Poor Bedouins come from thence to Cairo, bringing their camels loaded with coals. Such a load, which requires the labour of one man for ten or fifteen days to collect, is sold at Cairo for about three dollars, after a journey of ten or eleven days. With these three dollars, the man then purchases half a load of wheat, some tobacco for himself, and a pair of shoes or handkerchief for his wife, and returns the same distance to his tent; having been above five weeks employed, together with his camel, in procuring this scanty supply for the family. On such occasion a Bedouin will gladly forfeit the only sensual pleasure he can enjoy on the road, (eating butter and smoking tobacco,) rather than return to his home without some small present for his family, for the purchase of which he sacrifices, if necessary, even his butter-skin and tobacco-pouch.

Some Arab families pride themselves in having only herds of camels, without sheep or goats; but I never heard that there existed whole tribes without the latter. Those who have camels alone are mostly families of sheikhs; and in case strangers arrive for whom a lamb is to be killed, then the Arabs usually bring one for that purpose to the sheikh's tent. In some encampments, the Arabs will not permit their sheikh to slaughter a lamb on any occasion, but furnish by turns the meat for his tent. The families, who have camels only are called *ahel bel*, in opposition to the *ahel ghanem*.

But in the most desperate circumstances, without camels or sheep, a Bedouin is always too proud to show discontent, or much less to complain. He never begs assistance, but strives with all his might, either as a camel-driver, a shepherd, or a robber, to retrieve his lost property. Hope in the bounty of God, and a perfect resignation to his divine will, are deeply implanted in the Arab's breast; but this resignation does not paralyse his exertions so much as it does those of the Turks. I have heard Arabs reproach Turks for their apathy and stupidity, in ascribing to the will of God what was merely the result of their own faults or folly, quoting a proverb which says, "He bared his back to the stings of mosquitos, and then exclaimed, God has decreed that I should be stung." The fortitude with which Bedouins endure evils of every kind is exemplary: in that respect they are as much superior to us as we exceed them

in our eager search after pleasing sensations and refined enjoyments. Wise men have always thought that the amount of evil in this world was greater than that of pleasure; it seems therefore that he is more truly a philosopher who, although he knows but few refinements of pleasure, laughs at evil, than the man who sinks under adversity, and passes his happier moments in the pursuit of visionary enjoyments.

The secret hopes and expectations of the Bedouin are much more limited than those of the Arab who dwells in a town. His chief desire during a state of poverty is to become so opulent that he may be enabled to slaughter a lamb on the arrival of every respectable guest at his tent, and in this act of hospitality to rival at least, if not to exceed, all the other Arabs of his tribe. If fortune grant him the accomplishment of this desire, he then looks out for a fine horse or dromedary, and good clothes for his females: these objects once attained, he feels no other wish but that of maintaining and increasing his reputation for bravery and hospitality. For this reason it may be safely affirmed that there are among Bedouins, an infinitely greater number of individuals contented and happy with their lot, than among other Asiatics, whose happiness is almost always blighted by avarice, and the ambition of rising above their equals.

The Bedouin is certainly unhappy when he feels himself so poor that he cannot entertain a guest according to his wish; he then looks with an envious eye upon his more fortunate neighbours; he dreads the sneers of friends and of enemies, who regard him as unable to honour a stranger: but whenever he can contrive to display hospitality, he feels himself upon a footing of equality with the richest sheikh, towards whom he bears no envy on account of his more numerous flocks and herds, the possession of which does not procure to him any increase either of honours or enjoyments.

V. WARFARE AND PREDATORY EXCURSIONS.

The Arab tribes are in a state of almost perpetual war against each other; it seldom happens that a tribe enjoys a moment of general peace with all his neighbours, yet the war between two tribes is scarcely ever of long duration; peace is easily made, but again broken upon the slightest pretence. The Arab warfare is that of partisans; general battles are rarely fought: to surprise the enemy by a sudden attack, and to plunder a camp,

are chief objects of both parties. This is the reason why their wars are bloodless ; the enemy is generally attacked by superior numbers, and he gives way without fighting, in hopes of retaliating on a weak encampment of the other party. The dreaded effects of "blood-revenge," which shall be hereafter noticed, prevent many sanguinary conflicts : thus two tribes may be at war for a whole year without the loss of more than thirty or forty men on each side. The Arabs, however, have evinced on some occasions great firmness and courage ; but when they fight merely for plunder, they behave like cowards. I could adduce numerous instances of caravan-travellers and peasants putting to flight three times their number of Arabs who had attacked them : hence, throughout Syria, they are reckoned miserable cowards, and their contests with the peasants always prove them such ; but when the Arab faces his national enemy in open battle, when the fame and honour of his tribe are at stake, he frequently displays heroic valour ; and we still find among them warriors whose names are celebrated all over the desert ; and the acts of bravery ascribed to them might seem fabulous, did we not recollect that the weapons of the Arabs allow full scope to personal prowess, and that in irregular skirmishing the superior qualities of the horse give the rider incalculable advantages over his enemies. Thus we read in the history of Antar that this valiant slave, when mounted upon his mare *Ghabara*, killed with his lance, in a single battle, eight hundred men. However incredulous respecting the full amount of his statement, I may here be allowed to mention the name of a modern hero, whose praise is recorded in hundreds of poems, and whose feats in arms have been reported to me by many ocular witnesses. *Gedoua Ibn Gheyran el Shamsy* is known to have slain thirty of his enemies in one encounter ; he prided himself in having never been put to flight, and the booty which he took was immense. But his friends alone benefited by this, for he himself continued always poor. His life at last was sacrificed to his valour. A war broke out in the year 1790, between the *Ibn Fadhel* and *Ibn Esmeyr* tribes, while most of the *Aenezes* engaged themselves on one side or the other. After many partial encounters, the two sheikhs, each with about five thousand horsemen, met near *Mezerib*, a small town on the Hadj road, nearly fifty miles from Damascus, on the plain of Hauran, and both determined on a general battle that should terminate the war. The armies were drawn up in sight of each other,

and some slight skirmishing had commenced, when Gedoua (or, as the Bedouins in their dialect called him, *Djedoua*) formed the generous resolution of sacrificing his life for the glory of his tribe. He rode up to Ibn Esmeyr, under whose banners the Shamsy then fought, took off his coat of mail, and his clothes to his shirt, and approaching the chief, kissed his beard, thereby indicating that he devoted his life to him. He then quitted the ranks of his friends, and, without any arms besides his sabre, drove his mare furiously against the enemy. His valour being well known to the troops of both parties, every one waited with anxious expectation the result of his enterprise. The strength of his arm soon opened a way among the hostile ranks; he penetrated to their standard, or *merkeb*, which was carried in the centre; felled to the ground the camel that bore it by a stroke on its thigh; then wheeled round, and had already regained the open space between the two armies, when he was killed by a shot from a *metrás* or foot-soldier.* His friends, who had seen the *merkeb* fall, rushed with a loud cheer upon their enemies, and completely routed them; above five hundred foot-soldiers having been slain on that day. Whenever the *merkeb* falls, the battle is considered as lost by the party to whom it had belonged.

I have already mentioned, that the usual mode of warfare is to surprise by sudden attacks. To effect this the Arabs sometimes prepare an expedition against an enemy, whose tents are at a distance of ten or twenty days from their own. The Aenezes are not unfrequently seen encamped in the Hauran, and making incursions into the territory of *Mekka*; or a party of the *Dhofyr* Arabs from the vicinity of Baghdad, plundering the Aeneze encampments near Damascus; or some of the *Beni Sakr* tribe from *Djebel Belkaa*, seeking for pillage in the province of Irak Arabi. Whenever they resolve to undertake a distant expedition, every horseman who is to be of the party, engages a friend to accompany him: this *zammal*, or companion, is mounted on a young and strong camel. The horseman provides camel-bags, a stock of food, and water. He mounts behind the *zammal*, that his mare may not be fatigued

* The *metrás*, or foot-soldiers, are armed with fire-locks; they crouch down in front between the lines of horsemen, and place heaps of stones before them, on which they rest their muskets, that they may take a more certain aim.

before the decisive moment arrives. When the *ghazou*, or flying detachments, approach the enemy, their chief generally appoints three meeting-places, where the zammals are to wait for the horsemen who push forward to the attack. The first meeting-place is seldom more than half an hour's distance from the enemy's camp, in a *wády* (or valley), or behind a hill. If, at the appointed time, their party does not return to them, the zammals hasten to the second meeting-place, and halt there for a whole day in expectation of their friends; thence they proceed to the third station, where they are to remain three or four days; this place being always at a long day's distance from the object of attack, the enemy's camp. If, after the expiration of that time, none of their people return, they hasten homewards as fast as possible. Should the expedition have proved successful in the taking of booty, the zammal is rewarded with a she-camel, even though his friend's share should not amount to more than a single camel; but if the horsemen have been defeated, the zammal does not get any remuneration. It sometimes happens on distant expeditions, that all the horsemen are destroyed; if they are repulsed, and cut off from the zammals, who have with them the food and water, they must perish in the barren plain, or submit to be stripped and plundered.

Whenever an enemy comes from a distance to attack an encampment, he does not trouble himself about the property that may be in tents, but drives away the horses and camels. If, on the contrary, the enemy's camp is near, the conquerors take away the tents, and all that they contain. In such case, a courageous woman may recover one of her husband's camels, if she run after the retiring enemy, and call out to their chief, "O noble chief, I beg my nourishment from God and from you!—we shall be starved!" If she can keep up with the troop for any length of time, the chief will think himself bound in honour to give her a camel from his own share of the booty.

Whatever these Arabs take in a successful expedition, is shared according to previous agreement. Sometimes every horseman plunders for himself; at other times, an equal division is to be made. In the former case, whatever an Arab first touches with his lance is regarded as his sole property; thus, if a herd of camels be found, every one hastens to touch with his lance as many as he can before any other person, calling out as he touches each, "O N***, bear witness! O Z***, behold thou art mine." The chief of the *ghazou* (not always the

sheikh of the camp, but some other respectable man of the tribe) generally stipulates for an extra portion of the booty; for instance, that all the male camels taken should be his, or one tenth of the plunder above his ordinary share. If a large party take but a comparatively small booty, the chief on his return assembles the men, and the cattle that they had taken, before his tent, and then says to his companions, one after another, "Go thou and take one;" "and thou, go thou, and take one," etc. When all have taken an equal share, should some few remain, which it would be difficult to divide among such numbers, the chief pronounces the word *māleha*, (which I am unable to explain, for it cannot here signify *salted*); on this signal, they all rush upon the remaining cattle, and whatever beast a man first seizes, he retains as his own property.

The Aenezes never attack by night; this they regard as *boag* or treachery; for, during the confusion of a nocturnal assault, the women's apartment might be entered, and violence offered, which would infallibly occasion much resistance from the men of the attacked camp, and probably end in a general massacre—a circumstance which the Arabs constantly endeavour to avoid. An exception, however, must here be made; for the *Shammar* Arabs have a peculiar custom of attacking by night the enemy's camp, when it happens to be situated near their own. If they can reach it unobserved, they suddenly knock down the principal tent-poles; and whilst the surprised people are striving to disengage themselves from the tent-coverings which had fallen on them, the cattle are driven off by the assailants. This kind of attack they call *beyât*.

But the female sex is respected even among the most inveterate enemies, whenever a camp is plundered; and neither men, women, nor slaves, are ever taken prisoners. If the Arabs, after their camp has been plundered, receive a reinforcement, or can rally, they pursue the enemy; and whatever they can recover of the plundered property is returned to its original owner.

In the plundering of a camp, but few men are ever killed. As the camp is generally taken by surprise, defence would be useless against superior numbers; and an Arab never kills an unresisting foe, unless he has to avenge the blood of some relation.

The Bedouins who live in mountainous districts have fewer camels and horses than those of the plains, and therefore can-

not make so many plundering expeditions into distant quarters, and are less warlike than the others. Mountain warfare is moreover liable to many difficulties and dangers unknown in the open country: plunder cannot be so easily carried off, and the recesses of the mountains are seldom well known to any but their own inhabitants. Still there are very few tribes who are ever in a state of perfect peace with all their neighbours; indeed, I cannot at present recollect that this was the case with any one among the numerous tribes that I knew. The Sinai tribes were in 1816 at peace with all the Arabs in their neighbourhood, except the Sowaraka, a tribe dwelling near Gaza and Hebron.

I may here confirm what has been said respecting the martial spirit of the Bedouins; their cowardice when fighting for plunder only; and their bravery when they repel a public enemy. Of the last, they have given repeated proofs, during their wars with the Turks in Hedjaz, whom they defeated in every encounter; for the great battle of Byssel, in January 1815, was merely gained by the stratagems of Mohammed Aly Pasha. In that action whole lines of Bedouins, tied by ropes fastened to each other's legs, were found slaughtered, having sworn to their women at parting that they would never fly before a Turk. To adduce instances of personal valour among the Bedouins would be easy; but such instances are not altogether conclusive as to the character of a whole nation. Whoever has known the Bedouins in their deserts, must be perfectly convinced that they are capable of acts displaying exalted courage, and of much more steadiness and cool perseverance, in cases of danger, than their enemies, the Turks.

The most renowned warrior in the southern parts of Arabia was, during my residence in Hedjaz, *Shahher*, of the Kahtan tribe. He alone once routed a party of thirty horsemen belonging to the Sherif Ghaleb, who had invaded the territory of his Arabs. Ghaleb, who was himself a man of considerable bravery, said on this occasion that "since the time of the *Sword of God* (this is one of Aly's surnames), a stronger arm than Shahher's had not been known in Arabia." At another time, the Sherif Hamoud, governor of the Yemen coast, was repulsed with his escort of eighty mounted men by Shahher alone.

The sheikh of Beni Shammar, in Mesopotamia, whose name is *El Djerba*, or, as he is otherwise entitled, *Beney*, has also obtained great celebrity for his courageous deeds. When the troops of the Pasha of Baghdad were defeated in 1809, by the

Rowalla Arabs, Beney, with his cousin Abou Fares, covered their retreat; and these two horsemen fought against a multitude of the enemy's cavalry. In the desert, valour must alone be sought among the chiefs, who are generally as much distinguished for bravery as for the influence which they possess.

There is one circumstance that greatly favours the chance of a foreign general in his contests with the Bedouins.* They are but little accustomed to battles in which much blood is shed. When ten or fifteen men are killed in a skirmish, the circumstance is remembered as an event of great importance for many years by both parties. If, therefore, in a battle with foreign troops several hundred are killed in the first onset, and if any of their principal men should be among the slain, the Bedouins become so disheartened, that they scarcely think of further resistance; while a much greater loss on the side of their enemies could not make a similar impression on mercenary soldiers. But even the Arabs would only feel this impression at the beginning of a severe contest; and they would soon, no doubt, accustom themselves to bear greater losses in support of their independence, than they usually suffer in their petty warfare about wells and pasture-grounds. Of this, the Asyr Arabs, who were principally opposed to Mohammed Aly in the battle of Byssel, afford a striking example. Having lost fifteen hundred men in that action (from which their chief Tamy escaped with only five men), they recovered sufficient strength to be able, about forty days after, to meet the Turkish soldiers in another battle, in their own territory, a battle less sanguinary, although better contested than the former; but it ended, after two days' fighting, in the defeat and subsequent capture of Tamy.

When two hostile parties of Bedouin cavalry meet, and perceive from afar, that they are equal in point of numbers, they halt opposite to each other out of the reach of musket-shot; and the battle begins by skirmishes between two men. A horseman leaves his party and gallops off towards the enemy, exclaiming, "O horsemen, O horsemen, let such a one meet me!"

* But this must not flatter him with the hope of reducing them to perfect subjection; and if it be asked what could induce a foreign chief to attempt such a conquest, the answer may be given in a quotation from the letter of Abdallah Ibn Saoud, to the Grand-Signor:—"Envy does not spare even those whose dwellings are miserable huts in deserts, and upon barren hills."

If the adversary for whom he calls be present, and not afraid to meet him in combat, he gallops forwards; if absent, his friends reply that he is not amongst them. The challenged horseman in his turn exclaims, "And you upon the grey mare, who are you?" the other answers, "I am *** the son of ***." Having thus become acquainted with each other, they begin to fight; none of the by-standers join in this combat; to do so would be reckoned a treacherous action; but if one of the combatants should turn back, and fly towards his friends, the latter hasten to his assistance, and drive back the pursuer, who is in turn protected by his friends. After several of these partial combats between the best men of both parties, the whole corps join in promiscuous combat. If an Arab in battle should meet with a personal friend among the enemy's ranks, he turns his mare to a different side, and cries out, "Keep away? let not thy blood be upon me!"

Should a horseman not be inclined to accept the challenge of an adversary, but choose to remain among the ranks of his friends, the challenger laughs at him with taunts and reproaches, and makes it known, as a boast, during the rest of his life, that such a one ** would not venture to meet such a one ** in battle.

If the contest happen in a level country, the victorious party frequently pursue the fugitives for three, four, or five hours together at full gallop; and instances are mentioned of a close pursuit for a whole day. This would not be possible with any but the Bedouin breed of horses, and it is on this account that the Bedouin praises his mare, not so much for her swiftness as for her indefatigable strength.

It is an universal law among the Arabs, that if, in time of war or in suspicious districts, one party meet another in the desert, without knowing whether it be friendly or hostile, those who think themselves the stronger should attack the other; and sometimes blood is shed before they ascertain that the parties are friends; but this is not the case in the Wahaby dominions, where a strong party must pass a weak one without daring to molest it.

The Bedouin mode of fighting is most ancient. The battles described in the two best heroic romances (the *History of Antar*, and that of the tribe of *Beni Helâl*) consisted principally in single combats, like those above mentioned. It is more congenial with the dispositions of Bedouins, who are al-

ways anxious to know by whom a man has been killed—a circumstance which in a promiscuous attack cannot easily be ascertained.

VI. BLOOD-REVENGE, OR THAR.

The fundamental laws of blood-revenge are the same, and universal throughout the whole Arabian desert. The right to it exists every where within the *khomse* :* Arabian tribes residing in foreign parts have invariably carried this institution with them. We find it among the Libyan Bedouins, and all along the bank of the Nile, up to Sennar : wherever true Arabs are settled, there is a law, that for blood an atonement must be made by blood, or by a severe fine, if the family of the person slain or wounded will agree to such a commutation. They have rendered this independent of the public administration of justice, and have given the blood-revenge into the hands of the sufferer's family or of his friends, persuaded that a judicial punishment would not satisfy a person who had been so seriously hurt and insulted in private, and to whom the law of nature gave the right of revenge. The system of the Arabs' political corporation would prevent the arising of any public disorder from the retaliation between individuals ; every clan would stand forward in protection of any of its members unjustly persecuted ; and it seems, that in a rude state of society, whenever the security of the whole is not affected, each person has full right to retaliate an injury upon his neighbour. The Arab regards this blood-revenge as one of his most sacred rights, as well as duties ; no earthly consideration could induce him to relinquish it : and even among the degenerate and enslaved race of Egyptian peasants, trembling under the iron rod of Mohammed Ali, a Fellah plunges his dagger into the breast of the man who has murdered his brother, although he knows, that his own life must be forfeited for the deed ; for that Pasha has endeavoured, by all the means in his power, to suppress every remaining spark of independent feeling among his subjects.

The stronger and the more independent a tribe is, the more remote from cultivated provinces, and the wealthier its individuals, the less frequently are the rights of the *Thar* commuted into a fine. Great sheikhs, all over the Desert, regard it as a shame-

* That is, within the fifth generation.

ful transaction to compromise in any degree for the blood of their relations; but when the tribe is poor, and infected by the paltry spirit of neighbouring settlers in cultivated districts, the fine (or *dye*) is frequently accepted. To give up the right of personal revenge as well as of this fine, is a matter of which they cannot even form any notion, and the Arabs have a proverbial saying, "Were hell-fire to be my lot, I would not relinquish the *Thar*."

The fine for blood varies in almost every tribe. Among the Beni Harb, in Hedjaz, it is eight hundred dollars. The same sum has been fixed by the Wahaby chief, following the rule prescribed in the time of Mohammed, when Abu Beker declared the price of a free man's blood to be one hundred she-camels. Saoud has estimated every she-camel at eight dollars, and thus made it a sum of eight hundred dollars. He has done all in his power, to induce the Arabs throughout his dominions to give up this long-established right of private revenge, and to accept the fine in its stead. But he has seldom been able to prevail over their ancient prejudices: and the Bedouins feel much ill-will towards him for his endeavours to abrogate a law, which they regard as sacred.

Whenever an Arab has entered into a compromise with the family, to whom he owes blood, he addresses himself to his relations and friends, soliciting from them some contributions in sheep and lambs, that he may be enabled to make up the sum required. Among some tribes it is a custom, that contributions should be made, in proportionable shares, by all the individuals comprised within the *khomse*, and who are therefore liable themselves to suffer from the blood-debt, in case no payment of another kind be accepted. But this is not a general rule; and the *dammaroy* or homicide in many tribes must make up the sum himself, with his brothers and father only.

But in those tribes where contributions are made, the Arabs evince great liberality, when the man who asks their assistance is liked by his people. Their gifts are so abundant from every quarter, that he is not only enabled to make up the sum required, but is often enriched by the surplus; which, the debt being paid, remains with him as his own property. On such occasions, they likewise go about among their friends of foreign tribes soliciting assistance. This is seldom refused. A similar kindness is expected in cases of emergency; and there is no circumstance in which the Bedouins more fully prove the af-

section which they entertain for each other, as members of one great nation, than when they are thus called upon for their contributions. They may indeed be considered, on such occasions, as partners belonging to one extensive company, in the gains and losses of which every individual is more or less interested.

The same demand for assistance is made, whenever the cattle of an Arab has been driven off by the enemy. His friends never hesitate to contribute towards the reparation of his loss, although not always so liberally as in the cases mentioned above; when, besides their friendship for the sufferer, they are impelled by a national feeling: for a tribe esteems itself honoured by enumerating among its individuals, men who have slain enemies, and are therefore supposed to be persons of valour. If the sheikh of a tribe should happen to lose his property, by the attack of an enemy, all his Arabs voluntarily hasten to his relief; and if he be a favourite, they soon reinstate him to the full amount of the cattle, which he had lost.

When an atonement for blood is to be made among the Arabs of Sinai, the relations of the dammawy appoint a place of meeting with the family of the man who has been killed, that an arrangement may be settled; the killed man's friends having consented to the meeting. At the time fixed, both parties repair to the place appointed, with their wives, children, and all other relations: there they pass several days in feasting, and every guest that arrives is treated with great hospitality. Those, to whom the blood is due, then make their claims. As there does not exist any certain fine, or *dye*, among these Sinai Arabs (nor indeed among several other tribes), the sum at first demanded is exorbitant; but all the persons in company immediately agree in soliciting a diminution. For instance, a woman presents herself before the nearest relation of the deceased, and conjures him, by the head of his own infant child, to grant, for her sake, an abatement of two or three dollars. A respectable sheikh then declares, that he will not eat any food, until an abatement of one camel shall have been made for his sake; and, in this manner, all who are present crowd about the man who claims the fine for blood, and who at first assumes a very lofty tone, but allows himself to be flattered into a display of generosity, gradually remitting dollar after dollar, until a sum is at last mentioned which all parties agree in thinking a fair equivalent: this is paid by instalments at monthly intervals, and always perpetually discharged. Among those Arabs, twenty or

thirty camels generally suffice to settle the business. They likewise give, on such occasions, in payment, some of the date-trees which abound in the vallies of Sinai occupied by Bedouins.

It may be agreed perhaps to accept for the blood a fine comparatively small; but in this case the debtor (that is, he who killed the man) must acknowledge, that himself and his family are *hhasnai* (or persons in a state of obligation) to the other's representative: a declaration which gratifies the pride of one party, as much as it mortifies the other, and is therefore not often made, although it is not attended by any other consequence; in fact it is merely a nominal obligation. If adopted, it remains for ever in the two families. The Omran and Heywat Arabs observe this custom.

The Oulad Aly, a powerful Libyan tribe of Bedouins, inhabiting the desert between Fayoum and Alexandria, make it a rule never to receive the price of blood, unless the homicide, or one of his nearest kindred, should brave the danger of introducing himself into the tent of the person slain, and then say to the relations, "Here I am, kill me, or accept the ransom." The nearest relation may do as he pleases, without incurring any blame; for the stranger has voluntarily renounced the right of *dakheil*, which all the Libyan tribes hold as sacred as the Arabian. A man who gives himself up in this manner is called *messtakheeb*. If the enemy should meet him before he reaches his tent, an attack is almost always the result. If he enter the tent, a ransom is most commonly accepted; but instances to the contrary sometimes happen.

The two tribes of Omran and Heywat act upon a rule, which forms an exception to the general Bedouin system of blood-revenge remaining within the "khomse." When one of their people is killed by an unknown hand of a known tribe, they think themselves justified in retaliating upon any individual of that tribe, either innocent or guilty; and if the affair be compromised, the whole tribe contribute to make up the *dye*, or fine, in proportion to the respective property of each tent. For this reason, the Arabs say, that "the Omran and Heywat strike sideways,"—a practice which is much dreaded by their neighbours.

Among several other tribes, the blood of those who fall by the unknown hand of a known tribe is demanded from the sheikh, who pays the fine, to which his Arabs contribute. This practice,

however, is not by any means general ; and among the warlike tribes of the Eastern parts, whoever perishes by an unknown hand cannot be avenged by any legal proceedings ; although the Bedouins say, that two tribes will never be on terms of sincere friendship, as long as they know that blood continues unavenged between them.

The Arabs entertain such notions respecting the solemnity and sacredness of an oath, that when a man is even falsely suspected of having killed another, and the relations of the person slain tender to the accused an oath, by taking which he might free himself from the imputation, he sometimes agrees to pay the fine rather than swear. Whatever may be the consequences of taking an oath, it is considered as a permanent stain on the reputation of an Arab to have ever sworn a solemn oath. The formula, by which a charge of homicide is denied, I shall here set down :—

“ By God ! I have not pierced any skin,
Nor rendered orphan any boy.”

If a man be wounded in a scuffle, and should afterwards kill his antagonist, no allowance is made for the wound, but the full fine for killing a man is imposed, even though the slain person may have been the aggressor. Had not the man been killed, the wounded person would have received a considerable fine, as a recompense for the injury which he had suffered.

Among the Arabs of Sinai, when a murder happens, the aggressor either flies, or endeavours to compromise the affair by paying a fine ; he therefore places himself under the protection of some venerable men of his tribe. To this protection the friends of the deceased pay due respect during the space of thirty days. If, before the lapse of that time, he should not be able to effect an arrangement, he must fly, or expect that his life will be sacrificed to the deadly vengeance of his enemies.

What I have already said of “slaughter,” (*dhebakh*, is applicable to all tribes of Bedouins. In their wars with each other they make a distinction between “blood” and “slaughter,” having recourse to the latter only in cases of considerable irritation. It frequently happens, and especially among the mountain Arabs, (whose wars are always more sanguinary and inveterate than those among the inhabitants of plains, perhaps because less

frequent,) that one tribe puts to death all the males of their enemies whom they can possibly seize, without inquiring what number of their own people had been slaughtered by their adversaries. These, of course, retaliate, whenever an opportunity offers.

The general slaughter, where no one ever asks, or ever grants quarter, is still in practice among the Red-Sea Arabs, those of Southern Syria, and of Sinai; but peace is usually soon concluded and causes a cessation of the bloodshed. An Arab would be censured by his tribe, were he not to follow the general practice, or allow himself to be influenced by the dictates of humanity, should his companions resolve upon the slaughter. I believe that the cruel Israelitish slaughter of the captive kings (that is, Bedouin Sheikhs, for so the word *emîr*, or *malek*, must be translated,) may be traced to a similar custom prevalent in former times; and the chiefs might have insisted upon a strict adherence to the ancient usage, apprehending that a dereliction of it would tend to weaken the martial spirit of their nation, and render them less respected among their neighbours. Even now, Bedouins would be severely reproved by others for sparing the lives of individuals belonging to a tribe that would not shew mercy to them.

HOSPITALITY.

To be a Bedouin, is to be hospitable; his condition is so intimately connected with hospitality that no circumstances, however urgent or embarrassing, can ever palliate his neglect of that social virtue. It cannot, however, be denied, that in some instances their hospitality proceeds from vanity, and a desire of distinguishing themselves among their equals in the tribe. But if we could minutely examine the true motives of action in most men, we should find that virtue is seldom practised merely for its own sake, and that some secret accessory spring is often necessary to prompt the heart; charity, and the consciousness of our own frailty, thus teach us to respect even this secondary merit; and we must value a person for his virtuous actions, were they even dictated by policy. Where all foreigners are so much disliked, as among the Bedouins, we cannot wonder that their hospitality should be principally exercised towards each other: but I should myself be guilty of ingratitude for many proofs of kindness and commiseration, bestowed on me in

the desert, were I to deny that the hospitality of Bedouins extends to all classes, and is combined with a spirit of charity that eminently distinguishes those Arabs from their neighbours, the Turks: it is also better suited to the morals of a religion which they are taught to curse, than to the religion which they acknowledge.

As the Turks possess very few good qualities, it would be unfair to deny that they are in a certain degree charitable, that is, they sometimes give food to hungry people; but even this branch of charity they do not extend so far as the Bedouins, and their favours are bestowed with so much ostentation that they lose half their merit. After an acquaintance of two or three days, a Turk will boast of the many unfortunate persons, whom he has clothed and fed, and the distribution of his alms in the feast of Ramadhan, when both law and fashion call upon him for charity; and he offers a complete picture of the Pharisee in the temple of Jerusalem. It must, however, be allowed, that charity towards the poor is more generally practised in all parts of the East than in Europe; while, on the other hand, an honest but unfortunate man, ashamed to beg, yet wanting more than a scanty dish of rice, will probably find assistance in Europe sooner than in the East. Here, it seems to be the rich man's pride that he should have a train about him—a train of needy persons whom he barely keeps from starving, while they go almost naked, or blazon in the town his wonderful generosity, whenever he distributes among them some of his old tattered clothes.

The influx of foreign manners, by which no nation has ever benefited, seems to be pernicious in its effect upon the Bedouins; for they have lost much of their excellent qualities in those parts where they are exposed to the continual passage of strangers. Thus, on the pilgrim road, both of the Syrian and Egyptian caravan, little mercy is ever shown to *hadjys* in distress. The hospitality or assistance of the Bedouins in those places can only be purchased by foreigners with money; and the stories related by pilgrims, even if not exaggerated, would be sufficient to make the most impartial judge form a very bad opinion of Bedouins in general. This is also the case in Hedjaz, and principally between Mekka and Medina, where the caravan-travellers have as little chance of obtaining any thing from the hospitality of the Bedouins on the road, as if they were among the treacherous inhabitants of the Nubian Desert.

Yet, even in those places, a helpless solitary traveller is sure of finding relief; and the immense distance of space between Mekka and Damascus is often traversed by a poor single Syrian, who trusts altogether to Bedouin hospitality for the means of subsistence during his journey. Among such poor people, as Bedouins generally are, no stronger proof of hospitality can be given than to state, that, with very few exceptions, a hungry Bedouin will always divide his scanty meal with a still more hungry stranger, although he may not himself have the means of procuring a supply; nor will he ever let the stranger know how much he has sacrificed to his necessities.

The instances recorded by ancient writers of Arabian hospitality, seem frequently to me much exaggerated, or to describe a foolish prodigality, which neither honours the heart nor the head of the donor. To alight from one's horse, and bestow it upon a beggar who asks alms, and perhaps to give him also one's clothes, is a kind of whimsical ostentatious profusion that partakes more of folly than of generosity. This may be recognised in the late Mourad Bey of Egypt, loudly celebrated for munificence because, not happening to have any money about him, he gave to a beggar his poniard, mounted with jewels, and reckoned worth three thousand pounds. Similar acts generally answer their purpose in the East, where people's minds are dazzled rather than convinced; but they as little answer the purpose of well-directed charity, as the bags of money which the miser deposits in a secret chamber.

It cannot, however, be denied, that even now frequent instances occur among Bedouins, which evince hospitality carried to a pitch that might almost appear unnatural or affected, even to a generous European, but which is strictly consistent with the laws established in the desert; and I find the more pleasure in mentioning an anecdote on that subject, from its resemblance to a story related of Hatem el Tay, the most generous of ancient Arabs. Djerba, the present powerful sheikh of Beni Shammar in Mesopotamia, who is intimately connected in politics with the paschalic of Baghdad, was, many years ago, encamped in the province of Djebel Shammar, in the eastern desert, at a time when Arabia suffered most severely from dearth and famine. The cattle of himself and of his Arabs had already mostly perished from want of food, as no rain had fallen for a considerable time: at length there remained, of all the cattle, only two camels, which belonged to him. Under these circum-

stances, two respectable strangers alighted at his tent, and it was necessary to set a supper before them. No provisions of any kind were left in his own tent, nor could the tents of his Arabs furnish a morsel: dry roots and shrubs of the desert had for several days served as food to these people, and it was impossible to find either a goat or a lamb for the strangers' entertainment. Djerba could not bear the thought of allowing his guests to pass the night without supper; or that they should retire hungry to sleep. He therefore commanded that one of his two camels should be killed. To this his wife objected, alleging that their children were too weak to follow the camp next morning on foot, and that the camels were absolutely necessary for the removal of his own family and of some of his neighbours' wives and children. "We are hungry, it is true," said one of the guests, "but we are convinced of the validity of your arguments; and we shall trust to the mercy of God, for finding a supply of food somewhere to-morrow: yet," added he, "shall we be the cause that Djerba's enemies should reproach him for allowing a guest to be hungry in his tent?" This well-meant remark stung the noble-minded sheikh to the soul; he silently went out of the tent, laid hold on his mare, (the only treasure he possessed besides his camels,) and throwing her on the ground, was engaged in tying her feet that he might kill her for his guests, when he heard from afar the noise of approaching camels; he paused, and soon had the satisfaction of seeing two camels arrive, loaded with rice, which had been sent to him as a present from the province of Kasym. Of this anecdote I cannot doubt the truth, having heard it related frequently by Arabs of provinces totally different.

Whoever travels among Bedouins, whether rich or poor, and wishes to be on friendly terms with them, must imitate, as far as he can, their system of hospitality—yet without any appearance of prodigality, which would inspire his companions with a belief that he possessed immense wealth, and would render his progress difficult, in proportion to their increasing demands of money. He must likewise condescend (if it can be called condescension) to treat the Bedouins on terms of equality, and not with the haughtiness of a Turkish grandee, as travellers too frequently do. A Bedouin will be sociable, and prove himself a pleasant companion, without ever becoming insolent or impertinent, which is always the case with Syrians or Egyptians, whenever they are admitted to familiarity. That they may learn

respect, it is necessary to keep them at a proper distance; and they easily submit to this treatment, because they are not accustomed to any other. But, in living with a Bedouin, his feelings must not be wounded; he must be treated with friendliness; and in return he will seek for an opportunity of proving to you, that in his own desert he is a greater man than yourself. And why not treat kindly a man, who, if you were in the most abject and forlorn condition, would certainly treat you as a brother?

As a hint to travellers, I must here add, that letters of recommendation to *independent* Bedouin sheikhs are of very little use. If one of these sheikhs once promise to conduct a person in safety, he will keep his word, without considering how the traveller comes recommended to him; and a letter of the strongest recommendation, even if it were written by a Pasha (provided that the latter have no direct influence over the tribe), is but little regarded. The more a stranger is recommended, the more he must pay, and the more insatiable becomes the sheikh. Therefore, a traveller will do well to go amongst Bedouins as a poor man, or else to pay for his passage through their country by dint of money, without foreign aid.

Many tribes have the national reputation of being generous; others are reckoned stingy. Among the latter is the Beni Harb, a considerable tribe in the Desert of Hedjaz. The great profits which they derive from the Hadj caravans have perhaps rendered them parsimonious in proportion as they became more desirous of wealth. The same reputation of stinginess is attached to the Bedouins about Mekka, especially to the Koreysh, now a full tribe of from two to three hundred matchlocks. In the mountains of Sinai, stinginess is the reproach of a tribe called *Oulad Sayd*, a branch of the Sowaleha Arabs; and their neighbours have a proverbial saying in rhyme, which advises a person thus—"Sleep alone, rather than among the *Oulad Sayd*."

Generous men belonging to these stigmatized tribes, have at least the advantage of rendering themselves easily conspicuous and distinguished amongst the rest; and therefore it is said by the Arabs, that generosity is principally found among tribes reputed avaricious.

The guest, who enters an encampment of the Nedjd Bedouins usually alights at the first tent on the right side of the spot where he entered the dowar, or circle of tents. If he should pass that

tent and go to another, the owner of the slighted tent would think himself affronted.

After what has been related, it is scarcely necessary to say, that among the Aenezes a guest is regarded as sacred; his person is protected, and a violation of hospitality, by the betraying of a guest, has not occurred within the memory of man. He who has a single protector in any one tribe, becomes the friend of all the tribes connected in amity with that. Life and property may with perfect security be entrusted to an Aeneze; and wherever he goes, one may follow him; but his enemies become the enemies of the man whom he protects. The messengers between Aleppo, Baghdad, and Basrah, are always Aenezes. They formerly accompanied English gentlemen, returning from India or going there, through the desert; and although some few instances have occurred, of travellers being plundered on the road by strange tribes, it is certain that their Aeneze guides, however importunate in their demands for money, faithfully observed the engagement which they had made. I here may state a fact from my own experience.—In June 1810, I set out from Aleppo with a sheikh of the *Fedhán*: he had been plundered near Hamah by some Maualy Arabs, with whom the Aenezes were then at war. Most of his property, and the camels of his Arabs, having been restored through the influence of the mutsellim of Hamah, the sheikh continued his journey; but took fright on the Wahaby's approach to Damascus, near which city his family was encamped; he therefore refused to accompany me as far as Tedmor, but gave me a single guide to conduct me among the ruins, and proceeded on his way towards the south. I feared, at that time, that the sheikh had betrayed me; but it soon appeared that the single guide was a sufficient protector in every respect. All the Arabs whom we met received me with hospitality; and I returned with him across the desert to Jeroud, twelve hours distant from Damascus.

A guest, as well as the host himself, in an Arab tent, is liable to nocturnal depredation; certainly not from any individual of the host's family, but from *harámys* or *netáls*. Knowing, however, that such is the case, and jealous lest any circumstance should excite a suspicion of his own integrity, the host takes particular care of the stranger's mare or camel; and if rich and generous, should a robbery occur, he indemnifies the stranger

for whatever loss he may sustain while under the protection of his hospitality.

Strangers, who have not any friend or acquaintance in the camp, alight at the first tent that presents itself: whether the owner be at home or not, the wife or daughter immediately spreads a carpet, and prepares breakfast or dinner. If the stranger's business requires a protracted stay, as for instance, if he wishes to cross the desert under protection of the tribe, the host, after the lapse of three days and four hours from the time of his arrival, asks, whether he means to honour him longer with his company. If the stranger declares his intention of prolonging his visit, it is expected that he should assist his host in domestic matters, fetching water, milking the camel, feeding the horse, etc. Should he even decline this, he may remain, but will be censured by all the Arabs of the camp: he may, however, go to some other tent and declare himself there a guest. Thus every third or fourth day he may change hosts, until his business is finished, or he has reached his place of destination. The Arabs of a tribe in Nedjd welcome a guest by pouring on his head a cup of melted butter.

VIII. FEMALES.

Among people who assign to their women exclusively all the duties and menial offices of the tent, it cannot be supposed that the female sex meets with great respect. Women are regarded as beings much inferior to men, and, although seldom treated with neglect or indifference, they are always taught to consider that their sole business is cooking and working. While a girl remains unmarried, she enjoys, as a virgin, much more respect than a married woman; for the fathers think it an honour, and a source of profit, to possess a virgin in the family. Once married, a Bedouin female becomes a mere servant, busily occupied the whole day, whilst her husband lies stretched out in his own apartment, comfortably smoking his pipe. This arrangement he justifies by saying, that his wife should work at home, as he undergoes so much fatigue on journies. Nothing distresses the Bedouin women so much as fetching water. The tents are but seldom pitched very close to a well; and if this be only at half an hour's distance from the camp, the Bedouins do not think it necessary that the water should be brought upon camels: and when asses are not to be procured, the women must carry the

water every evening on their backs in long water-skins; and they are sometimes obliged to seek a second supply at the well.¹

Among the Arabs at Sinai and those of the Egyptian Sherkieh, it is an established rule, that neither men nor boys should ever drive the cattle to pasture.² This is the exclusive duty of the unmarried girls of the camp, who perform it by turns.³ They set out before sunrise, three or four together, carrying some water and victuals with them, and they return late in the evening. Among other Bedouins, slaves or servants take the flocks to pasture.

Thus early accustomed to such fatiguing duties, the Sinai women are as hardy as the men. I have seen those females running barefooted over sharp rocks where I, well shod, could with difficulty step along. During the whole day they continue exposed to the sun, carefully watching the sheep; for they are sure of being severely beaten by their father, should any be lost. If a man of their tribe passes by the pasturing ground, they offer to him some sheep's milk, or share with him their scanty stock of water, as kindly as their parents would have treated him in their tent. On other occasions, the Bedouin women, seeing a man pass on the road, sit down and turn their backs towards him; nor will they ever receive any thing from the hands of a stranger (who is not a relation) into their own hands, unless some friends be present. I have frequently passed women on the road who asked for biscuit or flour to make bread; this was set near them upon the ground, while their backs were turned towards us; and they took it up when we had retired a few paces. It has always appeared to me, that the more a tribe is connected with the inhabitants of towns, the stricter they are with respect to the seclusion of women. In the Mekka and Sinai mountains, a woman, if addressed by any stranger, will seldom return an answer: on the contrary, in the distant plains, I have freely conversed and joined in laughter with Aeneze, Harb, and Howeytat women. Their morals probably may be

¹ Comp. Gen. 24: 13 sq.—Ed.

² Among the Sinai Arabs, a boy would feel himself insulted were any one to say, "Go and drive your father's sheep to pasture;" these words, in his opinion, would signify, "You are no better than a girl."

³ Comp. Gen. 29: 6 sq. Ex. 2: 16 sq.—Ed.

rated in an inverse proportion to the pains taken for preserving them.

The respect which Bedouins bear to their mothers is much more exemplary, than that which they evince towards their fathers.

IX. SAGACITY IN TRACING FOOTSTEPS.

Here I must offer some observations on a talent which the Bedouins possess, in common with the free Indians of America—the faculty of distinguishing footsteps, both of men and beasts, upon the ground. In the American woods the impression is made upon grass, in Arabia upon sand; and in the examination of these impressions, the Americans and the Arabs are, perhaps, equally skilful. Although it may be said, that almost every Bedouin acquires, by practice, some knowledge in this art, yet a few only of the most enterprising and active men excel in it. The Arab, who has applied himself diligently to the study of footsteps, can generally ascertain, from inspecting the impression, to what individual of his own, or of some neighbouring tribe, the footstep belongs; and therefore is able to judge whether it was a stranger who passed, or a friend. He likewise knows, from the slowness or depth of the impression, whether the man who made it carried a load or not. From the strength or faintness of the trace he can also tell whether the man passed on the same day, or one day or two days before. From a certain regularity of intervals between the steps, a Bedouin can judge whether the man whose feet left the impression was fatigued or not; as, after fatigue, the pace becomes more irregular, and the intervals unequal. Hence he can calculate the chance of overtaking a man.

Besides all this, every Arab knows the printed footsteps of his own camels, and of those belonging to his immediate neighbours. He knows by the depth or slowness of the impression whether a camel was pasturing, and therefore not carrying any load, or mounted by one person only, or heavily loaded. If the marks of the two fore feet appear to be deeper in the sand than those of the hind feet, he concludes that the camel had a weak breast, and this serves him as a clue to ascertain the owner. In fact, a Bedouin, from the impressions of a camel's or of his driver's footsteps, draws so many conclusions, that he always learns something concerning the beast or its owner; and in some

cases this mode of acquiring knowledge appears almost supernatural. The Bedouin sagacity in this respect is wonderful, and becomes particularly useful in the pursuit of fugitives, or in searching after cattle.

I have seen a man discover and trace the footsteps of his camel in a sandy valley, where thousands of other footsteps crossed the road in every direction; and this person could tell the name of every one who had passed there in the course of that morning. I myself found it often useful to know the impression made by the feet of my own companions and camels; as from circumstances which inevitably occur in the desert, travellers sometimes are separated from their friends. In passing through dangerous districts, the Bedouin guides will seldom permit a townsman or stranger to walk by the side of his camel. If he wears shoes, every Bedouin who passes will know by the impression that some townsman has travelled that way; and if he walks barefooted, the mark of his step, less full than that of a Bedouin, immediately betrays the foot of a townsman, little accustomed to walk. It is therefore to be apprehended, that the Bedouins, who regard every townsman as a rich man, might suppose him loaded with valuable property, and accordingly set out in pursuit of him. A keen Bedouin guide is constantly, and exclusively occupied during his march in examining footsteps, and frequently alights from his camel to acquire certainty respecting their nature. I have known instances of camels being traced by their masters, during a distance of six days' journey, to the dwelling of the man who had stolen them.

Many secret transactions are brought to light by this knowledge of the *Athr*, or "footsteps;" and a Bedouin can scarcely hope to escape detection in any clandestine proceeding, as his passage is recorded upon the road in characters that every one of his Arabian neighbours can read.

X. HORSES.

It is a general but erroneous opinion that Arabia is very rich in horses; but the breed is limited to the extent of fertile pasture grounds in that country, and it is in such parts only that horses thrive, while those Bedouins who occupy districts of poor soil rarely possess any horses. It is found, accordingly, that the tribes most rich in horses are those who dwell in the comparatively fertile plains of Mesopotamia, on the banks of the

river Euphrates, and in the Syrian plains. Horses can there feed for several of the spring months upon the green grass and herbs produced by the rains in the vallies and fertile grounds, and such food seems absolutely necessary for promoting the full growth and vigour of the horse. We find that in Nedjd horses are not nearly so numerous as in the countries before mentioned, and they become scarce in proportion as we proceed towards the south.

In Hedjaz, especially in the mountainous regions of that country, and thence on towards Yemen, but few horses are to be seen, and these few are imported from the north. The Aeneze tribes on the frontiers of Syria have from eight to ten thousand horses; and some smaller tribes roving about that neighbourhood possess, probably, half as many. To the single tribe of Montefek Arabs, in the desert watered by the river Euphrates, between Baghdad and Basrah, we may assign at least eight thousand horses, and the tribes of Dhofyr and Beni Shammar are proportionably rich in those noble quadrupeds; while the province of Nedjd, Djebel Shammar, and Kasym, (that is from the vicinity of the Persian Gulf, as far as Medinah,) do not possess above ten thousand.

Among the great tribes on the Red Sea, between Akaba and Mekka, and to the south and south-east of Mekka as far as Yemen, horses are very scarce, especially among those of the mountainous districts. In the eastern plain between Beishe and Nedjran, horses are rather more numerous. The tribe of Kah-tan, residing in that quarter, is celebrated for its excellent studs; and the same may be said of the Dowaser tribe.

The settled inhabitants of Hedjaz and Yemen are not much in the habit of keeping horses; and I believe it may be stated as a moderate and fair calculation, that between five and six thousand constitute the greatest number of horses in the country from Akaba or the north point of the Red Sea, southwards to the shores of the ocean near Hadramaut, comprising the great chain of mountains and the lower grounds on the west of it, towards the sea. The great heat of the climate in Oman is reckoned unfavourable to the breeding of horses, which are there still more scarce than in Yemen. When I affirm, therefore, that the aggregate number of horses in Arabia, (as bounded by the river Euphrates and by Syria,) does not exceed fifty thousand, (a number much inferior to what the same extent of ground in any other part of Asia or in Europe would furnish,)

I am confident that my calculation is not by any means under the true estimate.

In this part of the East, I know not any country that seems to abound more in horses than Mesopotamia; the tribes of Curdes and Bedouins in that quarter probably possess greater numbers than all the Arabian Bedouins together, for the richness of the Mesopotamian pasture contributes materially to augment the breed.

The best pasturing places of Arabia not only produce the greatest number of horses, but likewise the finest and most select race. The best Koheyls of the *khome* are found in Nedjd, on the Euphrates, and in the Syrian deserts: while in the southern parts of Arabia, and particularly in Yemen, no good breed exists but those which have been imported from the north. The Bedouins of Hedjaz have but few horses, their main strength consisting in camel-riders and foot-soldiers, armed with matchlocks only. In all the country from Mekka to Medinah, between the mountains and the sea, a distance of at least two hundred and sixty miles, I do not believe that two hundred horses could be found; and the same proportion of numbers may be remarked all along the Red Sea, from Yembo up to Akaba.

The united armies of all the southern Wahaby chiefs who attacked Mohammed Aly Pasha in the year 1815, at Byssel, consisting of twenty-five thousand men, had with them only five hundred horsemen, mostly belonging to Nedjd, and the followers of Faisal, one of Saoud's sons, who was present with the troops.

Both the climate and pasture of Yemen are reckoned injurious to the health of horses: many of them die from disease in that country, where they never thrive; indeed, the race begins to fall off in the very first generation. The Imám of Sana, and all the governors of Yemen, derive an annual supply of horses from Nedjd, and the inhabitants of the sea-coast receive considerable numbers by way of Sowakin from the countries bordering on the Nile. The horses taken in 1810, by the Rowalla Arabs, from the defeated troops of the Pasha of Baghdad, were all sold by them to the horse-dealers of Nedjd, and by the latter to the Arabs of Yemen; who are not, it may be here observed, by any means so nice and fastidious in choosing blood horses, as their northern neighbours. During the government of the Wahaby chief, horses became more scarce every year among his Arabs. They were sold by their owners to foreign pur-

chasers, who took them to Yemen, Syria, and Basra; from which last-mentioned place the Indian market was supplied with Arabian horses, because they feared that Saoud or his successor might have seized them; for it had become the custom, upon any slight pretext of disobedience or unlawful conduct, to confiscate a Bedouin's mare as a forfeit to the public treasury. The possession of a mare, besides, imposed an obligation on the Bedouin of being in constant readiness to attend his chief during his wars; therefore many Arabs preferred the alternative of being altogether without horses.

In the district of Djebel Shammar, many encampments have been lately seen without a single horse, and it is well known that the Meteyr Arabs (between Medinah and Kasym) reduced the number of their horses, within a few years, from two thousand to twelve hundred. The late Sherif of Mekka possessed an excellent stud of horses: the best stallions of Nedjd were taken to Mekka for sale, and it became a fashion among the Bedouin women going on a pilgrimage to Mekka, that they should bring their husbands' stallions as presents to the Sherif, for which, however, they received in return, silk stuffs, ear-rings, and similar articles.

From all that has come to my knowledge, on the very best authority, I have no hesitation in saying, that the finest race of Arabian blood horses may be found in Syria; and that of all the Syrian districts, the most excellent in this respect is the Hauran, where the horses may be purchased at first cost, and chosen among the camps of the Arabs themselves, who occupy the plains in spring time. The horses bought up at Basra for the Indian market are purchased at second hand from Bedouin dealers, and an Arab will rarely condescend to offer a good horse at a distant market without a certainty of selling it. True blood horses of the khomse, as I have been credibly informed, seldom find their way to Basra; and most of the horses purchased there for the Indian market belong to the Montefyk Arabs, who are not very solicitous about giving a pure breed. It might perhaps be advisable for the great European powers to have persons properly qualified, employed in purchasing horses for them in Syria, as the best mode of crossing and ennobling their own studs. Damascus would be the best position for the establishment of such persons. I am induced to suspect that very few true Arabian horses, of the best breeds, and still less any of the first rate among them, have ever been imported into

England, although many horses of Syria, Barbary, and Egypt, have passed under the name of Arabs.

The Bedouins are of opinion that an Egyptian mare coupled with a blood Arabian produces a good breed, much better than that of the indigenous Syrian mares, whose breed is not considered of any value, even though crossed by the Koheyl. It would be erroneous to suppose, that the horses of the khomse, or the noble breed, are all of the most perfect or distinguished quality and beauty. Among the descendants of the famous horse Eclipse may be found mere hacks; thus I have seen many Koheyl that had little more to recommend them than their name, although the power of bearing considerable fatigue seems common to all of the desert race. The fine horses, however, of the khomse are far more numerous than the common horses belonging to the same breed; but still, among those fine horses, there can be found only a few worthy of being entitled "first rate," in respect to size, bone, beauty, and action; perhaps not above five or six among a whole tribe. It seems a fair and probable calculation to say, that the Syrian deserts do not furnish more than two hundred of that pre-eminent description, each of which may be estimated, in the desert itself, at from one hundred and fifty to two hundred pounds. Of these latter, I believe that very few, if any, have ever found their way to Europe, although it is through them alone that any successful attempt could be made to ennoble and improve the European race, while the horses usually exported are all of the second or third quality.

The Hedjaz Bedouins are accustomed to purchase mares from the Egyptian pilgrim caravan, and the fillies produced between these mares and good stallions they sell to the Arabs of Yemen. I never saw any geldings in the interior of the desert.

In Egypt itself, on the borders of the Nile, there is not any breed of horses particularly distinguished. The finest of that country are produced in those districts where the best clover grows; which is in Upper Egypt, about Tahta, Akhmim, and Farshiout, and in Lower Egypt, in the territory of Mensaleh. Very few Arabian blood horses ever come to Egypt, a circumstance not surprising, since their remarkable quality, the power of supporting fatigue, is but little requisite on the fertile borders of the Nile.

The Egyptian horse is ugly and of a coarse make, resembling more a coach horse than a racer. His chief defects are,

clumsy legs and knees, a short and thick neck. The head is sometimes fine; but I never saw an Egyptian horse having handsome legs.

They are not able to bear any considerable fatigue; but those that are well fed display much more brilliant action than the Arabian horses: their impetuosity renders them particularly desirable for heavy cavalry, and it is from this quality of the horse that the Egyptian cavalry have always founded their claim to celebrity. In their first onset the Egyptian horses are much superior to the Arabian; but when long marches become necessary, and the duties of light cavalry required, the Egyptians prove themselves infinitely less useful than the Koheyl.

The Libyan Bedouins derive their supplies of horses from their own breeds, as well as from Egypt. In the interior of the desert, and towards Barbary, they are said to have preserved the ancient breeds of Arabian horses; but this is not the case in the vicinity of Egypt, where the peculiar races are as little distinguished as among the Egyptians. Like the Arabian Bedouins, those Libyans exclusively ride mares.

Respecting the pedigrees of Arabian horses I must here add, that in the interior of the desert the Bedouins never refer to any among themselves; for they as well know the whole genealogy of their horses, as they do that of the owners. But when they take their horses to market at any town, such as Basra, Baghdad, Aleppo, Damascus, Medinah, or Mekka, they carry along with them a written pedigree, which they present to the purchaser; and it is only on such occasions that a Bedouin is ever found to possess the written pedigree of his horse; while, on the other hand, in the interior of the desert itself, he would laugh at being asked for the pedigree of his mare. This may serve to correct an erroneous account, elsewhere given, on the subject of such pedigrees.

In Upper Egypt the Maazy and Heteym Arabs, occupying the desert between the Nile and the Red Sea, have preserved among them the breed of the khomse. As in Arabia, horses are possessed by them in partnership. They divide each horse into twenty-four shares, or *kerat* (according to the division of landed property in Egypt, which is always by kerats), and different persons buy three, four, or eight kerats of the mare, and share proportionably in the benefits arising from the sale of the young breed. So little is known concerning the true breed of horses among the soldiers in Egypt, that when in the year 1812

Ibrahim Pasha's troops took ten Koheyl horses belonging to Heteym, the soldiers sold them one to another, as if they had been common Egyptian horses; while their former possessors valued them at least three times beyond that amount.

For a hundred Spanish dollars a good cavalry horse may, at any time, be purchased in Egypt. The highest price paid for an Egyptian horse is three hundred dollars; but for this horse a Bedouin would not give fifty dollars. The Mamelouks formerly esteemed the Koheyl of the desert, and expended considerable sums in propagating their breed in Egypt. The present masters of this country have not the same passion for fine horses as their predecessors; who, in many respects, had adopted Arab notions, and had made it a fashion among them to acquire a competent knowledge of horses, and to keep their stables upon a most extravagant establishment.

Here may be added to the names of Arabian breeds already mentioned:—

El Thámerye, of the Koheyl race.

El Nezahhy, a breed of the *Hadaba*. Some tribes reckon the *Nezahhy* stallions among the number of blood horses.

The *Manekye* and *Djolfé* are not considered as belonging to the *khomse* by the Arabs of Nedjd.

The *Hadaba* and *Dahma* breeds are much esteemed in Nedjd.

The horses of the *Messenna* breed (of the Koheyl race) are never used in Nedjd as stallions.

The Bedouins use all the horses of the *khomse* exclusively as stallions. The first horse produced by a mare belonging to a race not comprehended within the *khomse*, would, notwithstanding its beauty, and perhaps superior qualities, never be employed as a breeder. The favourite mare of Saoud, the Wahaby chief, which he constantly rode on his expeditions, and whose name, *Keraye*, became famous all over Arabia, brought forth a horse of uncommon beauty and excellence. The mare, however, not being of the *khomse*, Saoud would not permit his people to use that fine horse as a stallion; and not knowing what to do with it, as Bedouins never ride horses, he sent it as a present to the Sherif. The mare, *Keraye*, had been purchased by Saoud from a Bedouin of the Kahtan Arabs for fifteen hundred dollars.

A troop of Druses on horseback attacked, in the summer of 1815, a party of Bedouins in Hauran, and drove them into their encampment, where they were in turn assailed by a superior

force, and all killed except one man, who fled. He was pursued by several of the best mounted Bedouins; but his mare, although fatigued, continued her speed for several hours, and could not be overtaken. Before his pursuers gave up the chase they cried out to him, promising quarter and safe conduct, and begging that he would allow them to kiss the forehead of his excellent mare. Upon his refusal, they desisted from pursuing, and, blessing the generous creature, they exclaimed, addressing her owner, "Go and wash the feet of your mare, and drink up the water." This expression is used by the Bedouins to show their great love for such mares, and their sense of the services which they have rendered.

The Bedouins in general do not allow their mares to breed until they have completed their fifth year; but the poorer classes, who are eager for the profits arising from the sale of foals, sometimes wait no longer than the completion of the fourth year.

The price paid in Nedjd, when a stallion is occasionally hired, merely for the purpose of breeding, is one Spanish dollar; but the owner of the horse is entitled to decline the acceptance of this dollar as payment: if he think fit, he may wait until the mare brings forth. Should she produce a filly, he may claim a she-camel of one year; if the offspring prove male, he takes, in like manner, a young he-camel, as payment for the use of his stallion.

The Bedouins never allow a horse, at the moment of its birth, to fall upon the ground: they receive it in their arms, and so cherish it for several hours, occupied in washing and stretching its tender limbs, and caressing it as they would a baby. After this they place it on the ground, and watch its feeble steps with particular attention, prognosticating from that time the excellencies or defects of their future companion.

In Nedjd, the people feed their horses regularly upon dates. At Deraïeh, and in the country of El Hassa, dates are mixed with the *birsem*, or dried clover, and given to them as food. Barley, however, is the most usual provender throughout all parts of Arabia. The wealthy inhabitants of Nedjd frequently give flesh to their horses, raw as well as boiled, together with all the fragments of their own meals. I know a man at Hamabr, in Syria, who assured me that he had often given to his horses roasted meat before the commencement of a fatiguing journey, that they might be the better able to endure it. The same person also related to me, that fearing lest the governor of the town

should take a liking to his favourite horse, he fed it for a fortnight exclusively upon roasted pork, which excited its spirit and mettle to such a height, that it became absolutely unmanageable, and could be no longer an object of desire to the governor.

I have seen vicious horses in Egypt cured of the habit of biting, by presenting to them, while in the act of doing so, a leg of mutton just taken from the fire: the pain which a horse feels in biting through the hot meat causes it, after a few lessons, to abandon the vicious habit. Egyptian horses are much less gentle in their temper than the Arabian; they are often vicious—the Arabians scarcely ever—and require to be constantly tied, while the Arab horses wander freely and quietly about the camps like camels. Egyptian grooms are celebrated all over the East for their treatment of horses; insomuch that the Pashas and grandees throughout Asiatic Turkey make it a rule to have always a couple of them in their service. They curry the horse three or four times a day, and devote so much of their time and trouble to it, that it is usual in all parts of Egypt to have as many grooms as horses in the stable, each groom having the peculiar charge of one horse only.

The Wahaby chief, who possesses, indisputably, the finest stud of horses in the whole East, never allows his mares to be mounted until they have completed their fourth year. The common Bedouins, however, frequently ride them even before they have attained their third year.

It has been forbidden by the Wahaby chief, that his Arabs should sell one third of a mare, as frequently is practised by the Northern Aenezes. He alleges, that this custom often leads to unlawful and cheating tricks: but he permits the selling of one half of the mare.

During the whole year, the Arabs keep their horses in the open air; I never saw one even in the rainy season tied up under the tent of its owner, as may frequently be observed among the Turkmen. The Arab horse, like its master, is accustomed to the inclemency of all seasons, and, with very little attention to its health, is seldom ill. The Arabs never clean or rub their horses, but are careful in walking them gently whenever they return after a ride. From the time that a colt is first mounted, (which is after its second year,) the saddle is but seldom taken off its back; in winter time a sackcloth is thrown over the saddle, in summer the horse stands exposed to the mid-day sun. Those Arabs who have no saddles, ride upon a stuffed sheep-

skin, and without stirrups; they all ride without bridles, guiding the horse with a halter. This will not astonish the European reader, when he learns that the Bedouin horse is extremely good tempered, without any viciousness, and more the friend than the slave of his rider. The Arabs do not practise the game of the *djerid*, which often ruins the Turks' horses before they acquire perfect strength. The Arabs indeed are unacquainted with the Turkish mode of horsemanship, and those evolutions of which the Osmanlys are so vain. But their habits of riding without stirrups or bridle, of throwing the heavy lance in full gallop, and of balancing themselves, from early infancy, upon the bare back of a trotting camel, give to the Bedouin a more firm seat on his horse than the Osmanly can boast, although the latter may ride more gracefully.

The Arabs are ignorant of those frauds by which an European jockey deceives a purchaser; one may take a horse on their word, at first sight or trial, without any risk of being cheated; but few of them know how to ascertain a horse's age by its teeth. I once looked into the mouth of a mare, whose owner and many other Arabs were present: at first it was apprehended that I was practising some secret charm; and when the owner heard that by such inspection the mare's age might be ascertained, he seemed astonished, and wished that I should tell his own age by an examination of his teeth.

The Arabs believe that some horses are predestined to evil accidents; and, like the Osmanlys, they think that the owners of other horses must, sooner or later, experience certain misfortunes, which are indicated by particular marks on the horses' bodies. Thus, if a mare has a star on the right side of the neck, they believe that she is destined to be killed by a lance; if the star be on one of the shank-bones, the owner's wife, they think, will prove unfaithful to her husband, and the orthodoxy of the latter as a Muselmán is liable to suspicion. There are above twenty evil marks of this kind, which have, at all events, the bad effect of depreciating the horse's value by two thirds or more.

The Arabs do not mark their horses, as some imagine; but the hot iron, which they frequently apply in curing a disease, leaves an impression on the skin that appears like an intended mark.

XL. CAMELS.

Between the races of camels in the northern and southern countries, there is a considerable difference. In Syria and Mesopotamia they are covered by thick hair, and in general attain to a much greater size than in Hedjaz, where they have very little wool. The Nubian camel has short hair like a deer, as likewise the Nubian sheep, which prevents the Bedouins of that country from living under tents, (fabricated in Arabia from goat's and camel's hair), they are therefore obliged to construct portable huts made of mats and reeds; the Arabian camels are generally brown: many black camels are seen also among them. The further we approach the south in Egypt, the lighter or becomes the colour. Towards Nubia the camels are mostly white, and I never saw a black one in that country.

The largest camels are those from Anadolia, of the Turkman breed: the smallest that I have seen are those from Yemen. In the eastern desert the camels reputed best for saddle-riding, are those of the Beni Tay, in Mesopotamia, near the river of Euphrates. In mountainous countries camels are certainly scarce; but it is an erroneous opinion to think that camels are not capable of ascending hills. Thus in Hedjaz their numbers are very limited, because pasture is scanty. The country most rich and abundant in camels, is undoubtedly Nedjd, entitled on that account *Om el Bel*, or "The mother of camels." It furnishes Syria, Hedjaz, and Yemen with camels, which in these countries are worth double the price paid originally for them in Nedjd. During my residence in Hedjaz, a good camel was there estimated at the price of sixty dollars; and such was the want of pasturage and scarcity of provisions, that within three years, upon a moderate calculation, there died thirty thousand camels belonging to the Pasha of Egypt, at that time commanding in Hedjaz.

The Turkmen and Kurds from Anadolia purchase, every year, eight or ten thousand camels in the Syrian deserts, of which the greater number are brought there by dealers from Nedjd. They use them in propagating the breed of Turkman camels called *Maya*.

No country in the east is so remarkable for the rapid propagation of camels as Nedjd, during years of fertility. The Nedjd camels are likewise less susceptible of epidemic diseases

(and especially the *Djam*, which is much dreaded in various quarters of the desert), than any others; and on that account principally they are preferred by the Bedouins, who from the most distant parts of Arabia repair to Nedjd that they may renew their flocks.

Among the Bedouins, female camels are always more esteemed and dearer than the males. In Syria and Egypt, on the contrary, where the camels are chiefly wanted for their strength in bearing heavy loads, the males are most valued. The people who inhabit the towns and villages of Nedjd ride only she-camels on their journeys, because these support thirst better than the males; but the Bedouins generally prefer he-camels for riding. The common load of an Arabian camel is from four to five hundred pounds upon a short journey, and from three to four hundred pounds on a journey of considerable distance. The camels employed between Djidde and Teyf in the year 1814, or 1815, for carrying provisions to Mohammed Aly, had loads not exceeding two hundred and fifty pounds. The well-fed and well-watered Egyptian camels are equal in strength to the Anadolian; those of the largest size at Cairo will carry three bales of coffee, or fifteen hundred weight, from the town to the water side, about three miles distant. From Cairo to Suez, the same camels will carry ten hundred weight; and that space is a journey of three days. The longer the journey to be undertaken, and the fewer wells to be found on the way, the lighter are the loads. The Darfur camels are distinguished for their size and great strength in bearing fatigue under heavy loads; in this latter quality they surpass all the camels of North-Eastern Africa. Those which accompany the Darfur caravan to Egypt, are seldom loaded with more than four quintals. The Sennâr camels generally carry three and a-half, and are not equal in size to those of Darfur.

The capability of bearing thirst varies considerably among the different races of camels. The Anadolian, accustomed to cold climates, and countries copiously watered on all sides, must, every second day, have its supply of water; and if this be withheld in summer-time until the third day, on a journey, the camel often sinks under the privation. During the winter, in Syrian latitudes and in the Northern Arabian desert, camels very seldom drink unless when on a journey; the first succulent herbs sufficiently moisten their stomachs at that season of the year. In summer-time the Nedjd camel must be watered

on the evening of every fourth day ; a longer exposure to thirst on a journey would probably be fatal to him.

I believe that all over Arabia four whole days constitute the utmost extent to which camels can stretch their capability of enduring thirst in summer ; nor is it necessary that they should be compelled to thirst longer, for there is no territory in the rout of any traveller crossing Arabia where wells are farther distant than a journey of three entire days, or three and a half. In case of absolute necessity, an Arabian camel might perhaps go five days without drinking, but the traveller must never reckon upon such an extraordinary circumstance ; and after the camel has gone three whole days without water, it shows manifest signs of great distress.

The indigenous Egyptian camels are less qualified to endure fatigue than any others that I know : being from their birth well watered and fed on the fertile banks of the river Nile, they are but little accustomed to journeys in the desert of any considerable length ; and during the pilgrims' march to Mekka, several of them daily perish. There are not, of any race, camels that bear thirst more patiently than those of Darfur. The caravans coming from that country to Egypt, must travel nine or ten days' journeys on a rout which does not furnish any water ; and over this extent of ground they often pass during the heats of summer. It is true that many of the camels die upon the road, and no merchant undertakes such an expedition without a couple of spare camels in reserve ; but the greater number reach Egypt. There is not the slightest probability that an Arabian camel could ever perform such a journey, and still less a Syrian or Egyptian. The camels in most parts of Africa are more hardy than the Arabian.

Although I have often heard anecdotes related of Arabs who on their long journeys were frequently reduced to the utmost distress by want of water, yet I never understood that a camel had been slaughtered for the sake of finding a supply in its stomach. Without absolutely denying the possibility of such a circumstance, I do not hesitate to affirm that it can have occurred but very seldom ; indeed the last stage of thirst renders a traveller so unwilling and unable to support the exertion of walking, that he continues his journey on the back of his camel in hopes of finding water, rather than expose himself to certain destruction by killing the serviceable creature. I have frequently seen camels slaughtered, but never discovered in the

stomachs of any, except those which had been watered on the same day, a copious supply of water. The Darfur caravans are often reduced to incredible sufferings by want of water; yet they never have resorted to the expedient above mentioned, it may perhaps be practised in other parts of Africa, but it seems unknown in Arabia; nor have I ever heard, either in Arabia or Nubia, that camel's urine mixed with water was used to allay the creature's thirst in cases of extreme distress.

What is called in Egypt and Africa *hedjein*, and in Arabia *deloul*, (both terms signifying the camels trained for riding,) is in fact the same race with the heavy carrying beast, distinguished from the latter only as a hunter is from a coach-horse. Whenever an Arab perceives in one of his young camels any indication of its being small and extremely active, he trains it for the purposes of riding: and if it be a female, he takes care to match her with a fine well-bred male. For the temporary use of a male camel on such occasions the price is one dollar, among the Arabian Bedouins; being the same price that is paid for the similar services of a hired stallion. The breeds which I have mentioned are those of heavy transport camels, as well as the lighter kind destined for the saddle.

In Arabia, the best camels for riding, those of the most swift and easy trot, are said to be in the province of Oman. The *deloul el Omány*, is celebrated in all the songs of the Arabs. While I was at Djidda, Mohammed Aly Pasha received two of those camels as a present from the Imám of Maskat; they were sent by sea. In their appearance it would not perhaps have been easy to distinguish them from other Arabian camels; their legs, however, were somewhat more straight and slender; but there was in their eyes a noble expression, and something in the whole deportment, by which, among all animals, the generous may be distinguished from the common breed. Of other *delouls* in Arabia, the breeds most esteemed are those belonging to the tribes of Howeytat, of Sebaa (an Aeneze family), and of Sherarat. In North-Eastern Africa, where the *deloul* is called *hedjein*, the Sennár breed and that of the Nubian Bedouins are much preferred to any others for riding. The Darfur camels are by much too heavy to be used as *hedjeins* for the purposes of saddle-riding.

The good Nubian *hedjeins* are so very docile, and have so swift and pleasant an amble, that they supply the want of horses better than any other camels; most of them are whitish. In

swiftness they surpass any of the various camels that I have seen throughout those parts of the east.

The name *osháry* (implying a camel that travels in one day a ten days' journey) is known in Egypt and Nubia, where incredible stories are related concerning a race of camels that were accustomed to perform very wonderful expeditions. I have reason to doubt whether they ever existed but in the imagination of fanciful Bedouins. Were I to repeat the tales of Arabian and Nubian Bedouins on this subject, the circumstances would appear similar to those which too credulous travellers report of the *Barbary* camels, or a particular breed of them; circumstances which I shall never believe until they can be ascertained beyond doubt, and proved to be facts. An Ababde Bedouin told me once, at Assouan, that his grandfather went on some occasion from that place in one day to Siout, a journey of at least two hundred and fifty miles; and that the camel which had performed such an expedition, was not in the slightest degree fatigued. But I never could positively ascertain an instance of greater swiftness than what I shall immediately mention, and am persuaded that very few camels in Egypt or Nubia are capable of such an exertion.

The greatest performance of a *hedjein* that ever came to my knowledge, satisfactorily ascertained on credible authority, is that of a camel belonging to a Mamelouk Bey of Esne, in Upper Egypt, which he had purchased from a Bisharein chief for one hundred and fifty Spanish dollars. This camel was to go for a wager, in one day between sun-rise and sun-set, from Esne to Genne and back again, the whole distance being equal to a space of one hundred and thirty miles. It arrived about four o'clock in the afternoon at a village sixteen miles distant from Esne, where its strength failed, after having travelled about one hundred and fifteen miles in eleven hours, and twice passed over the Nile in a ferry-boat; this passage across the river requiring at least twenty minutes. A good English trotting mare could do the same, or perhaps more, but probably not in such a warm climate as that of Egypt. Without so much forced exertion, that camel would probably have gone a distance of one hundred and eighty or even two hundred miles within the space of twenty-four hours; which, according to the slow rate of caravan-travelling, might be reckoned as equivalent to ten days' journeys; therefore, the boast above mentioned, of performing

a journey of ten days in one day may not appear altogether extravagant.

But it would be absurd to suppose any beast capable of running ten times, for an entire day, as a man could go on foot during the same space of time ; and the swiftness of a camel never approaches, for short distances, even to that of a common horse. The gallop of a camel (which is not that quadruped's natural pace) it can never sustain above half an hour, and its forced exertion in galloping never produces a degree of speed equal to that of an ordinary horse. The forced trot of a camel is not so contrary to his nature, and he will support it for several hours without evincing many symptoms of being distressed. But even of that forced trot I must here remark, that it is much less expeditious than the same pace of a moderately good horse, and I believe that the rate of twelve miles an hour is the utmost degree of celerity in trotting that the very best bedjein can accomplish ; it may perhaps gallop at fullest speed eight or even nine miles in half an hour, but it cannot support so violent an exertion for any longer time.

It is not, therefore, by extreme celerity that the bedjeins or delouls are distinguished, however surprising may be the stories related on that subject, both in Europe and in the East. But they are perhaps unequalled by any quadrupeds for the ease with which they carry their rider during an uninterrupted journey of several days and nights, when they are allowed to persevere in their own favourite pace, which is a kind of gentle and easy amble, at the rate of about five miles or five miles and a half in the hour. To describe this pleasant ambling pace, the Arabs say of a good deloul, "His back is so soft that you may drink a cup of coffee while you ride upon him." At the rate above mentioned, if properly fed every evening (or in case of emergency only once in two days), the strong camel will continue ambling for five or six days. I know of camels that went from Baghdad to Sokhne (in the desert of Aleppo) within the space of five days. This is a caravan journey of twenty-one days. Messengers sometimes arrive at Aleppo on the seventh day after they have left Baghdad, distant a journey of twenty-five days, according to the common calculation ; and I have known couriers go from Cairo by land to Mekka (forty-five days' usual journey) in eighteen days, without even changing their camels.

The first thing about which an Arab is solicitous respecting

his camel, when going to undertake a long journey, is the hump. Should he find this well furnished with fat, the Arab knows that his camel will endure considerable fatigue even with a very moderate allowance of food, because he believes that, according to the Arabic saying, "The camel, during the time of that expedition, will feed upon the fat of its own hump." The fact is, that as soon as the hump subsides, the camel begins to desist from much exertion, and gradually yields to fatigue. After a long journey the creature almost loses the hump, and it requires three or four months of repose and copious nourishment to restore it; which, however, does not take place until long after the other parts of the body have been replenished with flesh. Few animals exhibit so rapid a conversion of food into fat, as camels. A few days' rest and plentiful nourishment produce a visible augmentation of flesh, while, on the contrary, a few days employed in travelling without food reduce the creature almost immediately to little more than a skeleton, excepting the hump, which resists the effects of fatigue and starvation much longer.

If a camel has reached the full degree of fatness, his hump assumes the shape of a pyramid, extending its base over the entire back, and occupying altogether one fourth of the creature's whole body. But none of this description are ever seen in cultivated districts, where camels are always, more or less, obliged to work. They are only found among the wealthy Bedouins in the interior of the desert, who keep whole herds of camels merely for the purpose of propagating the breed, and seldom force more than a few of the herd to labour. In spring time, their camels, having been fed for a couple of months upon the tender verdure, increase so much in fat, that they no longer seem belonging to that species of the hard-labouring, caravan or peasant camel.

After the fore teeth of the camel have reached their full length, the first pair of back teeth appear in the beginning of the sixth year; but two years more must elapse before they attain their greatest size. Early in the eighth year the second pair of back teeth, standing behind, and quite separate from the other teeth, make their appearance; and when they are complete, in the tenth year, the third and last pair push forward, and, like the former, grow for two years. The camel, therefore, has not completed its full growth before the twelfth year, and then it is called *rās*. To know the age of a camel under that period, the back teeth are always inspected. The camel lives as long as

forty years; but after twenty-five or thirty his activity begins to fail, and he is no longer capable of enduring much fatigue. If a camel that has passed his sixteenth year become lean, the Arabs say that he can never be again rendered fat; and in that case they generally sell him at a low price to the peasants, who feed their cattle better than the inhabitants of the desert.

The common hedjein saddle in Egypt (very slightly differing from a horse-saddle) is called *ghabeit*. The hedjein saddle of the Nubians, imported likewise into Egypt, and very neatly worked in leather, is called *gissa*. The pack-saddle of the Egyptian peasant, different from that of the Arabians and Syrians, is called *shaghour*. (From this word the Arabians derive an opprobrious appellation, which they bestow upon the Egyptian peasants, whom they style *shaghaore*.) The pack-saddles of the Libyan, Nubian, and Upper Egyptian Bedouins are called *Hawye*, and are the same as those of the Arabians.

The deloul saddle is, throughout every part of Arabia, called *shedád*. The asses in Hedjaz are saddled with the *shedád*, differing only in proportionable size from that used with the deloul.

In Hedjaz the name of *shebrye* is given to a kind of palanquin, having a seat made of twisted straw, about five feet in length, which is placed across the saddle of the camel, with ropes fastened to it. On its four sides are slender poles, joined above by cross bars, over which either mats or carpets are placed, to shade the traveller from the sun. This among the natives of Hedjaz is the favourite vehicle for travelling, because it admits of their stretching themselves at full length, and sleeping at pleasure.

Similar machines of the palanquin kind, but on a shorter and narrower scale, are placed lengthwise on both sides of the camel's saddle, and then called *shekdef*. One person sits in each of them, but they do not allow of his stretching out at full length. Both of these shekdefs are covered, likewise, with carpets thrown across; and this vehicle is principally used for the conveyance of women.

Different from that is the *taht roán* (or rather *takht raván*, as the Persians, from whom the term is borrowed, call it); a litter carried by two camels, one before, and the other behind. In this kind of vehicle the great pilgrims travel: but it is more frequently used by the Turks than by the Arabians.

It is the fashion in Egypt to shear the hedjein as closely as a

sheep is shorn; and this is done merely from a notion that it improves the beast's appearance. The French, during their occupation of Egypt, had established a corps of about five hundred camel-riders, whom they selected from the number of their most brave and excellent soldiers, and by means of whom they succeeded in checking the Bedouins. Many horsemen among the troops of the Pasha of Egypt have been ordered by him to keep *hedjeins*; and his son, Ibrahim Pasha, has about two hundred of his men mounted in that manner.

The *hedjeins* of Egypt are guided by a string attached to a nose-ring. Those of Arabia are very seldom perforated in the nose; and are more obedient to the short stick of the rider than to the bridle.

The Arab women, on all occasions, make a great display in the fitting-out of their camel-saddle. A woman of Nedjd would think herself degraded, were she to ride upon any other than a black camel; but, on the contrary, a lady of the *Aenezes* much prefers a grey or white camel.

The practice of mounting upon camels small swivel-guns, which turn upon the pommel of the saddle, is not known in Egypt. I have seen them in Syria; and they appear to be common in Mesopotamia and Baghdad. Although of little real service, yet against Arabs these small swivel-guns are a very excellent and appropriate weapon, more adapted to inspire them with terror than the heaviest pieces of artillery.

The price of a camel is found to vary in almost every place: thus, in Egypt, according to the abundance and cheapness of provisions, the price of the same camel may fluctuate from twelve to forty dollars. A good dromedary, or *hedjein*, from Nubia, sometimes will cost at Cairo eighty dollars. In Hedjaz very high prices are paid for camels; fifty and sixty dollars are sometimes given for a *deloul* of the most common kind. There is a considerable demand in Nedjd for *delouls* of the first quality. Saoud has been known to pay as much as three hundred dollars for an *Oman* camel.

The Arabs distinguish in their camels various defects and vices, that very much affect their value. The principal defect is called *el asaab*; this is the camel's fetlock; and they regard it as incurable, and a proof of great weakness. The next is *el fetek*, a strong tremor in the hind legs of the camel when it couches down, or rises up: this, likewise, is considered as a proof of weakness. *El serrar*, ulcerations below the chest; *el*

kelkel, *el fahoura*, and many others. Most of the caravan camels are broken-winded (or *sedreh khorbân*) from excessive fatigue, and the carrying of too heavy loads. When this circumstance occurs, the Arabs cauterise the camel's chest. They resort also to the same process, cautery, in cases of wounds on the camel's hump, and of injuries frequently occasioned by bad pack-saddles, and burdens of too great weight. Towards the close of a long journey scarcely any evening passes without the cauterising operation, yet the next morning the load is placed again upon the part so recently burnt: but no degree of pain induces the generous camel to refuse the load, or throw it on the ground. It cannot, however, be forced to rise, if from hunger or excessive fatigue its strength has failed.

XII. LOCUSTS.

It has been remarked in my different journals, that these destructive creatures are found in Egypt, all along the river Nile as far as Senmar, in the Nubian, and in all parts of the Arabian deserts. Those that I have seen in Upper Egypt came all from the north; those that I saw in Nubia were all said to have come from Upper Egypt. It seems, therefore, that such parts of Africa are not the native places of the locusts. In the year 1813, they devoured the whole harvest from Berber to Shendy in the Black countries; and in the spring of that same year I had seen whole flights of them in Upper Egypt, where they are particularly injurious to the palm-trees. These they strip of every leaf and green particle, the trees remaining like skeletons with bare branches.

In Arabia the locusts are known to come invariably from the East, and the Arabs accordingly say that they are produced by the waters of the Persian Gulf. The province of Nedjd is particularly exposed to their ravages; they overwhelm it sometimes to such a degree, that having destroyed the harvest they penetrate by thousands into the private dwellings, and devour whatever they can find, even the leather of the water vessels. It has been observed, that those locusts which come from the East are not considered so formidable, because they only fix upon trees, and do not destroy the seed; but they soon give birth to a new brood, and it is the young locusts, before they are sufficiently grown to fly away, that consume the crops. According to general report, the locusts breed as often as three times in the year.

The Bedouins who occupy the peninsula of Sinai are frequently driven to despair by the multitudes of locusts, which constitute a land plague, and a most serious grievance. These animals arrive by way of Akaba (therefore from the East), towards the end of May, when the Pleiades are setting, according to observations made by the Arabs, who believe that the locusts entertain a considerable dread of that constellation. They remain there generally during a space of forty or fifty days, and then disappear for the rest of the year.

Some few are seen in the course of every year, but great flights every fourth or fifth year; such is the general course of their unwelcome visits. Since the year 1811, however, they have invaded the peninsula every successive season for five years, in considerable numbers.

All the Bedouins of Arabia, and the inhabitants of towns in Nedjd and Hedjaz, are accustomed to eat the locusts. I have seen at Medinah and Tayf locust-shops, where these animals were sold by measure. In Egypt and Nubia they are only eaten by the poorest beggars. The Arabs, in preparing locusts as an article of food, throw them alive into boiling water, with which a good deal of salt has been mixed; after a few minutes they are taken out, and dried in the sun; the head, feet, and wings are then torn off, the bodies are cleansed from the salt and perfectly dried; after which process whole sacks are filled with them by the Bedouins. They are sometimes eaten broiled in butter; and they often contribute materials for a breakfast, when spread over unleavened bread mixed with butter.

It may here seem worthy of remark, that among all the Bedouins with whom I have been acquainted in Arabia, those of Sinai alone do not use the locusts as an article of food.

ART. VI. LITERARY NOTICES, ETC.

I. *Modern Hebrew Manuscripts.* From Henderson's *Travels in Russia*, p. 206 sq.

On my return through Dubno,* I stopped a few hours in order to visit some of the Jews, by whom it is chiefly inhabited.

*Dubno is not far from Ostrog, in the government of Volhynia.—
Ed.

Their number is estimated at upwards of 10,000, and many of them appear to be in affluent circumstances. They have a great number of synagogues; the principal one of which I found greatly resembling our oldest Seceding Meeting-houses in Scotland, having high arched windows, brass chandeliers, and the pulpit, wainscoting, doors, etc. all of unpainted wood. In the ark of this synagogue were preserved several beautiful copies of the law, some written with large, and others with smaller characters. I here made inquiry, as I did in other places, relative to ancient MSS. of the Hebrew Scriptures, but found none of any great age. The fact is, when no longer fit for public use in the synagogue, instead of being sold, or kept as objects of curiosity, they are carefully inclosed in a box, and deposited in the burying-ground, it being deemed a most heinous offence to erase or obliterate a single letter of the law, or expose it to the profane gaze of the Gentiles. Some may smile at this custom of interring the Scriptures, and regard it as a superstitious veneration for the mere letter of the word; but it must certainly be viewed as praiseworthy, when contrasted with the manner in which many professing Christians treat mutilated and worn-out copies of the Bible, by using them in a variety of ways as waste-paper, in total absence of reverence for that sacred name which stands forth so prominently in every page. How laudable the practice adopted by the Schleswig-Holstein Bible Society! In order to prevent defective copies from falling into the hands of the grocers, the Committee buy up all the old Bibles to be found, and, after endeavouring to complete them from each other, they collect what is no longer fit for use, and, with becoming solemnity, consume it in a fire kindled for the purpose.

Having expressed a wish to obtain some Hebrew manuscripts, my Jewish guide conducted me down a narrow lane to the house of a *Sopher*, or scribe, whose employment consists in multiplying written copies of the law, according to the established rules of Hebrew calligraphy. His small apartment presented quite a novel scene to my view. On the table before him lay developed an accurate exemplar from which he was taking his copy; rolls of parchment were lying about in every direction: the walls were hung with compasses, inkbottles, and other implements; and in one corner of the room, a number of skins were in a process of preparation for the use to which they were to be appropriated. As I entered, he looked up with all that absence and discomposure which generally characterises those

who are abruptly roused from the absorption connected with deep study, or occupied about some object requiring the application of profound attention. Some remarks, however, on the nature of his occupation, interspersed with a few technical phrases in Hebrew, soon excited his curiosity ; and, laying aside his pen, he readily entered into a conversation respecting his business, and the difficulties inseparable from its proper and conscientious execution.

Unlike other employments, that of a Jewish copyist absolutely and religiously excludes all improvement. He is tied down to perform every part of the work exactly as it was done twelve or thirteen centuries ago, at the period of the composition of the Talmud, to the laws of writing prescribed in which, he must rigidly conform, even in the smallest minutiae. The skins to be converted into parchment must be those of clean animals ; and it is indispensable that they be prepared by the hands of Jews only. Should it be found that any part has been prepared by a *Goi* (a name by which Christians and all who are not Jews are designated), it is immediately thrown aside as unfit for use. When ready they are cut even, and joined together by means of thongs made of the same material. They are then regularly divided into columns, the breadth of which must never exceed the half of their length. The ink employed in writing the law, generally consists of a composition made of pitch, charcoal, and honey, which ingredients are first made up into a kind of paste, and after having remained some time in a state of induration, are dissolved in water with an infusion of galls.

Before the scribe begins his task, and after every interruption, he is required to compose his mind, that he may write under a sensible impression of the sanctity of the words he is transcribing. Particular care is taken that the letters be all equally formed ; and so supreme is the authority of antiquity, that where letters are found in the exemplar of a larger or smaller size than the rest, or such as are turned upside down, or suspended above the line, or where a final-shaped letter occurs in the middle of a word, these blunders are to be copied with as great fidelity as any part of the text. Is it not passing strange, that even Christian editors of the Hebrew Bible, should have servilely followed these Jewish puerilities ? It is well known what importance the genius of Rabbinical superstition has attached to such anomalies ; and it is a fact, that many of them are interpreted in a manner highly reproachful to the religion of Christ.

For instance, in Psalm lxxx. 14, the word מִן הַיֵּדֵב, "from the wood," is written and printed מִן הַיֵּדֵב, with the letter *ain* suspended, because it is the initial of the word עֵץ, "tree," and is explained by the Jews, of the cross; while the wild boar referred to in the context, they blasphemously interpret of our blessed Saviour. Yet this error of transcription is printed in the editions of Opatius, Michaelis, Van der Hooght, Frey, Leusden, and Jahn, although corrected in Menasseh Ben Israel's edition of 1635!

Faults that creep in during transcription may be rectified, provided it be done within the space of thirty days; but if more time has elapsed, the copy is declared to be *posel*, or forbidden—a word (פסיל) used in Scripture to denote a graven image, which the Israelites were taught to hold in utter detestation. Should Aleph-Lamed (אֶלֶף) or Jod-Hâ (יָד) be wrongly written, it is unlawful to correct or erase them, because they form the sacred names; nor is it permitted to correct any of the Divine names, except when they are applied in an inferior sense. Of this an instance occurs, Gen. iii. 5, where the name אֱלֹהִים, *Elohim*, is used twice. The Rabbins, regarding it as employed the second time to denote false objects of worship, permit its erasure; but prohibit it at the beginning of the verse, as being undeniably used of the true God. When transcribing the incommunicable name יְהוָה, *Jehovah*, the scribe must continue writing it until it be finished, even although a king should enter the room; but if he be writing two or three of these names combined, such as אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת יְהוָה, *Jehovah God of Hosts*, he is at liberty, after having finished the first, to rise and salute his visitant. Nor is the copyist allowed to begin the incommunicable name immediately after he has dipped his pen in the ink; when he is approaching it, he is required to take a fresh supply when proceeding to write the first letter of the preceding word.

Shackled by canons of such exquisite minuteness, it cannot be matter of surprise that the *Dubno* Scribe should exhibit an emaciated appearance, and affix a high price to the productions of his pen. For a copy of the law, fairly written in small characters, he asked ten louis-d'ors, and assured me that he had been sometimes paid at the rate of fifty. To the intrinsic value and spiritual beauty of the law of the Lord he appeared totally insensible!

Turning round the corner of a square, my attention was arrested by an immense number of books that were lying open

on the ground. Conceiving that they were exposed for sale, and finding, on reaching them, that they were Hebrew, I eagerly commenced an examination of the more bulky and respectable looking volumes; but I was soon undeceived by a Jew, who seemed to be watching them, by whom I was informed, that they belonged to the Synagogue, and were not to be sold. Besides several copies of the Talmud, there appeared to be a complete collection of all kinds of works in Rabbinical literature.

II. *Jewish Wedding. Illustration of Matt. XXV.* From the same, p. 216.

Before retiring to rest [at Kamenetz in Podolia], we were stunned by the noise of a procession, led on by a band of musicians playing on tambourines and cymbals, which passed our windows. On inquiry, we learned that it consisted of a Jewish bridegroom, accompanied by his young friends, proceeding to the house of the bride's father, in order to convey her home to her future residence. In a short time, they returned with such a profusion of lights, as quite illuminated the street. The bride, deeply veiled, was led along in triumph, accompanied by her virgins, each with a candle in her hand, who, with the young men, sang and danced before her and the bridegroom. The scene presented us with an ocular illustration of the important parable recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew; and we were particularly reminded of the appropriate nature of the injunction which our Saviour gives us to watch and be ready, for the re-procession must have commenced immediately on the arrival of the bridegroom.

III. *Further Notice of the Karaites.* See p. 665 above.

We subjoin here, as an additional notice of the Karaites of Taurida, the following graphic description of their fortress, Djufut-Kalè, from the pen of the celebrated Russian traveller, Muriaviev-Apostol.*

"Venice is a city in the water, Djufut-Kalè a city in the air. The dwellings of the Karaites hang like eagles' nests around the summit of a steep inaccessible rock; within, the city is cleanly and neat; its pavement is the solid rock. The Karaim, or more

* See p. 385 of this Vol.

correctly, the Karaites, are, in their customs and mode of living, Tartars; in their religion, Jews, genuine Jews, who have preserved the Mosaic law among them in greater purity than any other tribe. Since the fourth century a portion of the Jews have rejected the Talmud; but it was only in the eighth century that this led to a formal separation of the sects. The Karaites, under Aaron and Saul, declared off from the Rabbinites; but their sect remained small; and they are estimated in Europe and Asia at only 4430.* They reject the Kabbala and the Talmud; and observe the Sabbath still more strictly than the Rabbinic Jews. At the same time, they are more cleanly, more domestic, and more industrious than the latter; they daily descend from their nests, wander into Baghtchisarai, follow there traffic or trades, and return at night through wind and storm back to their nests. Zion and Jehoshaphat,† the enjoyments of life and the hopes of the grave, all centre for them upon this naked rock."

IV. Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament.

The Editor would take this opportunity of accounting to the public for any apparent delay in the publication of the above named work, and also of making known some of the principles on which the preparation of it is conducted.

The work as first published in 1825, was, as it professed to be, mostly a translation of the first edition of Wahl's '*Clavis Philologica*;' although several of the more important articles were rewritten, and the whole sedulously revised. It was the first attempt of Wahl; it was also the first labour of the translator; the lexicons of Bretschneider and Passow were not then accessible. Since that time the labours of eminent men abroad have been given to this subject; while the lexicography of the Greek language in general has received a new form from the hand of Passow. After the lapse of nine years, too, spent in this and kindred studies at home and abroad, and with free access to all the earlier stores as well as to what has recently appeared in this department, the Editor hopes that he himself may be in a better situation to make a work adapted to the present state of science and to the wants of our theologians, than before. It was his first hope, that a mere revision might suffice; so that the new

* Comp. p. 673 above.

† Comp. p. 669 above.

edition might have appeared before the present time. But on examination, he has found it necessary to write the whole anew, on a plan more comprehensive than any of the existing lexicons; and combining in all cases a reference to both the elements of which the New Testament idiom is composed,—the *common* dialect or later Greek on the one hand, and the Jewish or Hebrew influence on the other. The work is now in press, and is proceeding with all the rapidity which such an undertaking permits; but the writer will rejoice, if, by the blessing of God, he shall be able to complete it in another year. It is and will be the object of his daily, though not ungrateful toil; and not improbably may, under God, become the chief labour of his life. The number of pages will be very considerably enlarged; but, it is hoped, that no increase of price will be necessary.

The work was commenced, and has thus far been constructed, upon the general principles exemplified in the lexicons of Gesenius and Passow, so far as they are applicable to the New Testament. The following are some of the points of special attention:

1. To exhibit the etymology of every word, and assign its primary signification, whether found in the N. T. or not; then, to deduce from this, in logical order, all the significations which occur in the N. T. but not others.

2. To keep ever in view the difference between signification and sense; and to shew in each case whether the apparent meaning of a word arises from itself, or from the influence of the adjuncts. In this way, the multiplicity of meanings given by Schleusner and other lexicographers, is greatly diminished.

3. To shew by proper illustrations and references, in what relation each word stands to the Attic and later Greek, and also to the Sept. and Hebrew; and whether it is common to all or any of these, or found in none. A purely *historical* mode of illustration is, of course, not adapted to the New Testament.

4. To shew particularly the force and power of the prepositions in composition; a point hitherto almost wholly overlooked.

5. To give in every instance the various construction of verbs, adjectives, etc. with their cases and other adjuncts. Unusual or difficult constructions, also, are every where noted and explained.

6. To exhibit, so far as is proper in a lexicon, the various forms and inflexions of words,—and particularly any variety or irregularity of form.

7. To make each article, so far as practicable, include a re-

ference to every passage of the New Testament where the word is found. In this way the lexicon becomes almost a complete New Testament Concordance.

8. To bestow upon the interpretation of difficult passages all the attention which the limits of a lexicon permit; that thus it may in a measure supply the place of a more extended commentary upon the New Testament.

Such is the plan of the work. How far the author may be able to succeed in it, will belong to the theological public to judge.

V. *Miscellaneous.*

The Leipzig semi-annual Book-Catalogue of July 1, 1834, gives the titles of the following works as published in the first half of the present year.

1. *BIBLIA HEBRAICA, ex recensione Hahnii expressa. Præfatus est E. F. C. Rosenmueller. Editio Stereotypa. Lips. Tauchnitz, large 12mo. Pr. 2 rixd.* This is a corrected reprint of Hahn's Hebrew Bible, in a smaller form.

2. On Isaiah we find the following works: *HITZIG, F. Der Prophet Jesaja, übersetzt und ausgelegt, pp. 680. ROSEN-MUELLER, Scholia in V. Test. P. III. Vol. III. Etiam sub tit. Jesajæ Vatic. annot. perpet. illustr. Vol. III. ed. 3.* This last is a new edition of Rosenmueller's third Vol. on Isaiah in his large work. It is not the Compend, or smaller work.

3. The Epistle to the Romans is also the fruitful source of commentary: *JAEGER, C. F. H. Der Lehrgehalt des Römer-Briefs entwickelt, pp. 80. Tübingen. REICHE, Prof. in Göttingen, Versuch einer ausführlichen Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer, mit historischen Einleitungen und exegetisch-dogmatischen Excursen. 2 Bde. Price 4 rixd.*

4. The Epistle to the Ephesians seems likewise at present to be the object of special attention in Germany, no less than three new commentaries upon it being announced, viz. *HOLZ-HAUSEN, Der Brief an die Epheser übersetzt und erklärt, pp. 220. 8vo. MATTHIES Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser, pp. 200. 8vo. RÜCKERT L. F. Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser erläutert und vertheidigt, pp. 312. 8vo.*

5. *KALKAR C. H. de Cantico Deborah, Jud. V. pp. 108. 8vo.*

6. **OLSHAUSEN** Prof. H. (Königsb.) Wert der Verständigung über die Stellung des Evangeliums zu unserer Zeit, pp. 24. 8vo.

7. **OLSHAUSEN** Prof. J. (Kiel,) Zur Topographie des alten Jerusalem, pp. 84. 8vo.

8. **ORIGINIS Opera Omnia**, ed. De La Rue, denuo rec. C. H. E. Lommatzsch, Tom. I—III. Berl.

9. **RHEINWALD**, Prof. De pseudodoctoribus Colossensibus, Comm. exegetico-hist. pp. 20. 4to.

10. **SCHNECKENBURGER** M. Ueber den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangeliums; pp. 176. 8vo. Stuttg.

11. **SCHNEIDER** P. J. Biblisch-geschichtliche Darstellung der Hebräischen Musik, pp. 120. 8vo. Bonn.

12. **SCHOTT** und **WINZER**, Commentarii in Epistolas N. T. Vol. I.—Etiam sub titulo, Epist. Pauli ad Thess. et Gal. comment. perpet. illustr. H. A. Schott, pp. 632, 8vo. Leipz.

13. **FRETTAG**, G. W. Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, Tom. III. Sect. 1. i. e. the first part of the last volume.—Also, *Chrestomathia Arabica* grammatica-historica in usum schol. ex codicibus ineditis conscripta. pp. 221. 8vo. Bonn.

14. **GESENIUS**, de Bar Alio et Bar Bahlulo, lexicographis Syro-Arabicis ineditis. pp. 68. 4to.—The *eleventh* edition of his small Hebrew Grammar has also appeared.

15. A second edition of **VON HAMMER**'s great work, 'Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches,' is also in progress.

16. **RITTER** C. Ueber das historische Element in der geographischen Wissenschaft, pp. 60. 4to. Berl.

17. **ROST** V. C. F. Kleine Grammatik des Attischen Dialects, pp. 288. 8vo. Götting.

18. **SCHMIDT** J. J. Grammatik der Mongolischen Sprache, pp. 384. 8vo. St. Petersburg. This writer is the celebrated oriental, or rather Mongol scholar, mentioned on p. 386 of this volume.

19. **SIEBOLD**, P. F. *Nippon*, Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan, etc. (2 Numbers and Atlas.) pp. 600. fol. Price 17½ rixd. This is the commencement of the great work descriptive of Japan which we have already noticed, Bibl. Repos. III. p. 760.

20. **SUIDAE Lexicon**, post Küsterum rec. TH. GAISFORD

S. T. P. III Tom. Fol. Oxon. Lond. et Lips. Pr. 61 $\frac{1}{2}$ rind.—
The edition by Bernhardt of Halle, in 2 vols. quarto, is in progress.

21. The third Volume or *Section* of NEANDER's 'Kirchengeschichte' is in press, comprising the period from A. D. 510 to A. D. 813, in one part or volume.—His 'History of the Apostolic Age,' is announced as being in a course of translation in England.

ART. VII. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

In closing, as we here do, our editorial labours, we are happy in being able to lay before our readers the subjoined extracts of letters from Christian friends abroad. The excellent catholic spirit which they breathe, will, we doubt not, be responded to in full by the American churches. To the Editor himself, also, it cannot but be gratifying to learn, by such a voice from a remote quarter of the globe, that his own labours have not been wholly in vain.—ED.

I. *Extracts from a letter to the Editor from the Rev. W. H. PEARCE, Member of the English Baptist Mission at Calcutta.*

CALCUTTA, 26TH MARCH, 1834.

MY DEAR SIR,

To a benevolent mind nothing can be more grateful than the conviction, that its labours are extensively beneficial. Under this impression, you will hear with pleasure that on the shores of the sacred Ganges, and by Missionaries of another denomination and of a different nation, your labours as Editor of the *Biblical Repository* are known and appreciated. Having sometime since procured, through an unknown but valued friend, all the numbers of this work as far as published, I have felt in it a great degree of interest. The design and the execution cannot but commend themselves to every biblical student; while the work is *peculiarly* valuable to Missionaries like ourselves engaged in preparing translations of the sacred oracles for the use of

heathen nations. May it be long continued and vigorously supported!

I have not time to allude particularly to the state of missions here. In individual conversions we are not making much progress; in *general impression* throughout the country, Christianity is rapidly advancing. We greatly need *more labourers*; and shall be most happy to welcome more *American* brethren, be they of what denomination they may, to fellowship in our exertions and success.

I have the pleasure to forward, by this conveyance, a letter from a most intelligent and benevolent gentleman, possessed of much influence, recommending your Board to establish a mission in Ajmere. This, as well as all other parts of this vast country under British authority, is now accessible to Christian Missionaries of all denominations or nations; and I hazard nothing in saying, that to our Government and to most of the native Princes around us, the fact of sustaining the missionary character has now ceased to be an obstacle to the employment of any one in the great work of national education, which is commencing all around us.

I have the pleasure of ranking among my dearest friends several students of Andover and Princeton, as well as our own seminaries; and shall be truly rejoiced to receive under our roof, in progress to their respective stations, many more from these excellent Institutions. Pray make my respects acceptable to the instructors at Andover, (unknown they are, yet beloved for their works' sake,) and present to the students, especially to those preparing for the pains and pleasures of a missionary life, my most affectionate regards.

I remain,

My Dear Sir,

Yours most sincerely,

W. H. PEARCE.

II. *Extracts from a letter to the Editor from PROF. NEANDER of the University of Berlin. Translated from the German.*

BERLIN, JULY 6, 1834.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

It was very pleasing to me, after having been so long without any external connexion with you, to receive some intelligence

directly from your own hand. I thank you heartily for the numbers of the Repository. I rejoice to see such an intercourse of mind and spirit set on foot between the United States and Germany. Indeed, Christianity is doubtless to become the element of catholic union among all nations; and one of the delightful signs of the times is, that it already begins to manifest itself as such. I rejoice also in the free and pious evangelical spirit, which shews itself among your young theologians.

* * * *

Here with us the old and the new stand in manifold contrast and conflict with each other; out of which it is reserved for the Spirit of God, to build up the higher unity, upon the one only foundation, Christ. O, that this one foundation, in the midst of all differences, might ever secure constant love and communion! You will have heard of the death of that great man, Schleiermacher, which makes an epoch among us. The manner of his christian departure, so edifying to all, was the seal of that which animated his life; and served as a confutation to some zealous partisans, who were unwilling to acknowledge him as a Christian. He was a great instrument of God, in Germany, in forming a point of transition from unbelief to belief, and in preparing the way for an epoch of new developement in theology, the consequences of which may probably extend themselves beyond the ocean,—a new epoch, which, in contrast both with the old Scholastics and the later Rationalism, shall set theology free from the fetters of school-wisdom. This new creation it remains for the future to unfold. May He, who alone is able, bring it both here and there to a glorious accomplishment, when the hour destined by Him shall have arrived! The church and the world are in the throes!

For yourself I implore his richest blessings, in body and in spirit.

From the heart yours,

NEANDER.

With these impressive views of the respected Neander, the Editor bids the readers of the Repository FAREWELL!

INDEX I.

HEBREW AND GREEK WORDS ILLUSTRATED.

I. Hebrew.

אֵשׁ 107	חֵלֶב 604	נֶפֶשׁ 183
אֲנֹכִי 107	חֵלֶל 602	צָבָה 601
בֶּן נֶפֶשׁ 183, 184	יָהוָה 89 sq.	שָׁמַע 140
בְּמֹת 601	מִשְׁחָה 604	

II. Greek.

ἅγιος 274, 275	ἐξέστημεν 68	Ναζαρέτ 182 sq.
ἄζυμοι 271	ἐπερώτημα 273	ναζωραῖος 182 sq.
ἀκαθάρτος 274	ἐπέχειν 63	νοῦς 250
ἀνάγκη 64	ἐπίσκοποι 254 sq.	Ο
ἀνθρώπινος 68	ἐπισύστασις 68	ὁ, ἡ, τό, art. 277 sq.
ἄπιστος 248	ἔργα 684 sq. 694 sq.	οἱ ἕκ τινος 71
ἀπλότης 68	ἐρμηνεία πνευμ. 251	οἰκοδομεῖν 245
ὁ πό 152	ἐτεροζυγεῖν 68, 79	οἰκοδομή 245
ἀπόκριμα 68	εὐαγγελισται 262	Π
ἀτελεύτητος 67	Ζ	παρασκευή 115
Γ	Ζεῖς 105	πάσχα 111
γλώσσαις λαλεῖν 247, 249	Θ	πίστις 684 sq. 694 sq.
γνώσις 252	θεός, derivat. 105	πληρώσαι 75, 76
Δ	θησαυρίζειν 268	πνεῦμα 249
Δεῦς 105	Ι	πνευματικοί 70
διάκονος 263	Ἰαῶ 95	ποιμένες 261
διάκρισις πνευμ. 251	Ἰεσῶ 98	προεσβύτεροι 254, 260
διδασκαλία 247 sq. 258	Κ	προσέχειν τινί 63
διδύσκαλοι 247 sq. 260	καταναρκῆν 68, 70	προφητεύειν 247
δικαιοῦσθαι 686, 691	κοινωνία 68	Ρ
δικαιοσύνη 694, 696	κυβέρνησις 254, 260	ῥακά 80
δυνατοί 68	Λ	Σ
Ε	λόγος γνώσιως 252	σαρκικοί 70
ἐβραῖος 139	— ζωῆς 64	σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα 70
ἐκ τινος, ὁ, as adj. 71	— σοφίας 252	σεβαῖωθ 96
		σοφία 252

INDEX II.

TEXTS ILLUSTRATED.

Genesis		1 Corinthians		12: 2 145
21: 25 sq.	713	1: 19	68	Galatians
24: 13 sq.	744	3: 1	70	1: 16 146, 149
26: 15 sq.	713	5: 7	270	2: 11 sq. 692
29: 6 sq.	744	7: 14	274, 275	4: 9 sq. 266
Exodus		9: 1	146	6: 1 70
2: 16	744	10: 13	68	6: 6 262
1 Samuel		10: 16	68	Philippians
31: 4—6	547	11: 5	257	2: 16 64
2 Samuel		14: 14	249	2 Thessalonians
1: 19—27	594 sq.	14: 22, 24	248	2: 12 325
Matthew		14: 34	257	1 Timothy
2: 23	182 sq.	15: 47	72	2: 12 257
5: 17	75	16: 2	268	5: 3 sq. 263, 264
5: 22	80	16: 15	265, 273	5: 10 263
16: 17	70	2 Corinthians		6: 2 273
25: 1 sq.	770	1: 9	68	Titus
John		5: 13, 14	68	2: 13 322
1: 1	331	6: 7	80	James
3: 31	71, 72	6: 14	79	2: 14—26 683 sq.
8: 23	71	8: 2	68	1 Peter
18: 37	71	8: 19	265	3: 21 272
Acts		9: 11	68	4: 4 64
1: 20	84, 85	10: 1	68	2 Peter
3: 21	84	10: 12	80	3: 18 325
8: 6	63	11: 8	68	Jude
29: 1	148	11: 23	152	4 324
Romans		11: 28	68	
14: 5 sq.	267	11: 30	150	
		11: 32	150	

INDEX III.

SUBJECTS, ETC.

A.

- Abel-Remusat*, *Memoire sur Lao Tseu*, 97—opinion in respect to the name Jehovah, 97.
- Achillas*, 54.
- Aeneze*, see *Bedouins*.
- Alexandrian School*, 1—commencement and duration, 10—its occasion and object, 12—its management, 13—advantages of its location, 15 sq.—support of its teachers, 20—its influence, 22—and doctrines, 190 sq. 617 sq.
- Anquetil du Perron's* translation of the Zend Avesta, 606 sq.
- Anthropology*, psychological, 129—doctrines of the Alexandrian School, 617 sq.
- Apologetics*, 131.
- Arabs*, see *Bedouins*.
- Archaeology* Biblical, the study of it recommended to the theological student, 133, 135—its necessity for the right interpretation of the scriptures, 175.
- Arius*, 56.
- Armenian Literature*, opportunities of acquiring a knowledge of it in Russia, 386—Literary notice, 415
- Article* Greek, see *Hints*.
- Ascetics*, 131.
- Athenagoras*, 25—his views on inspiration, 190—on the trinity, 204 sq.—on the nature of man, 617 sq.—on the future state, 642.
- Auxiliary Sciences* for the study of Theology, 128 sq.

B.

- Bedouins*, the Aenezes of Syria, 711—mode of encamping, 712 sq.—food and cookery, 714 sq.—mode of eating, 719—industry, 729—wealth and property, 720 sq.—warfare and predatory excursions, 724 sq.—blood revenge, or Thar, 732 sq.—hospitality, 737 sq.—kind of charity peculiar to the oriental nations, 738 sq.—anecdote of Djerba, sheikh of Beni Shammar, 739 sq.—treatment of females, 743 sq.—sagacity of the Bedouins in tracing footsteps, 745 sq.—horses, 746 sq.—where the finest race of Arabian blood horses, 749 sq.—prices, 752—names of Arabian breeds, 752—superstition of the Arabs, attached to their horses, 755—camels, 756 sq.—locusts, as food, 765 sq.
- Bible*, the only foundation of all Christian theology, 156—necessity of a free and personal investigation, 156 sq.—advantages of an attentive study of the originals, 157 sq.—translated into Slavonic by Cyril and Methodius, 349 sq.—editions of the Old Slavic Bible, 357—first Russian Bible, 367 sq.—Russian Bible Society, 379 sq.—Dalmatian translations of the Bible, 404, 405.—Vindish translation, 412—Bohemian Bibles, 444—Polish

versions, 483—translations of the Lusatians, 530, 531.

Bible Society, Russian, 379 sq.

Blood-Revenge, see *Bedouins*.

Bohemian Language and Literature, merits and distinguished talent of the nation, 419 sq.—first settlement of the Tchekhes in Bohemia, 420 sq.—extent and character of the language, 423 sq.—first period of its history, 425 sq.—second period, 431 sq.—third period, 454 sq.—fourth period, 455 sq.—fifth period, 459—literary and philological works, 463, 464.

Bopp's labours upon the Zend language, 609.

Burckhardt, notes on the Bedouins, 711 sq.

Bulgarians, see *Servians*.

Burnouf's edition of the *Vendidad Sade*, 606 sq.

C.

Camels, see *Bedouins*.

Casus, 131.

Catechetical School at Alexandria, 1 sq.

Catechetics, 133.

Champollion, letters from, 413 sq.

Charismata, 245 sq.

Chasidim, a Jewish sect, 663 sq.

Chinese name for a trinity, 97.

Christian Church and Christian life in connexion with the church, as developed among heathen Christians, 241 sq.—primitive church, 242 sq.—*Charismata*, 245 sq.—gift of teaching, 247—speaking with tongues, 248 sq.—gifts of healing, etc. 253—Church officers and teachers, 254 sq.—*Deaconesses*, 263 sq.—choice of officers, 264—Festivals and the Lord's Day, 266 sq.—Sacraments, 271 sq.

Christianity, among the Heathen, 275 sq.—first planting of, in Great Britain, 534 sq.—in England, 534 sq.—in Scotland, 536—in Ireland, 540 sq.—Schools and learning, 548 sq.—the monastery of Iona, 552.

Church, see *Christian Church*.

Clement of Alexandria, 30—his views on divine providence, 200—on the trinity, 209 sq.—on the nature of man and the freedom of the will, 618 sq.—on the future state of man, 643 sq.

Comenius, his life and works, 456 sq.

Constance, council of, 435.

Course of theological study in Leipzig, 127 sq.

Creation, doctrines of the Alexandrian school, 196 sq.

Croatians, their country and nation, 335 sq.—their language and literature, 407 sq.

Crucifixion, time of our Lord's last passover and, 108 sq.—see *Passover*.

Cyril, inventor of the Slavic alphabet, 348—sketch of his life, 349 sq.—what parts of the Bible he translated, 351 sq.

D.

Dalmatians, see *Servians*.

Didymus the Blind, 58—his views on omnipotence and the nature of God, 194 sq.—on inspiration, 191—on the trinity, 238 sq.—on the nature of man, 638 sq.—on the future state, 661.

Dionysius, 49—his views on the trinity, 235 sq.—on the nature of man, 637—on the future state, 660.

Djufut Kalè, 666. See *Karaites*.

Dobrovsky's, merits in respect to the Slavic languages, 346, 347,

357, 461 sq. his principal works, 462.

Dogmatics, 130, 131.

Donnegan's Lexicon, 577 sq.

E.

Eastern Stem of the Slavic nations, 333, 334, 345 sq.

Egypt, whether the origin of the Hebrew rites is to be looked for in Egypt, 90 sq.—opinions of theologians on the name of Jehovah, 93 sq.—inscription on the Saitic temple of Isis, 98 sq.—Letters from Egypt and Nubia by Champollion, 413 sq.

Eschatology, doctrines of the Alexandrian school, 624, sq.

Ethics, Christian, or moral theology, 130 sq.

F.

Frommann, on the apparent discrepancy between Paul and James, 683 sq.

G.

Geography Sacred, the necessity of a thorough knowledge of it for the right understanding of the N. Testament, 173 sq.

German Philosophy, 610 sq.—peculiar character of the philosophy of different nations, 611, 612.

Gifts in the primitive church, see *Christian Church*.

Glagolitic Literature, 401 sq.

Greek Article, Hints on, see *Hints*.

Greek Lexicons, see *Lexicography*.

H.

Hebrew Language, see *Interpretation* and *Philology*.

Hengstenberg on the expression: He shall be called a Nazarene, 182 sq.

Henotics, 131.

Hermeneutics, 130.

Heraclas, 48.

Hints and Cautions respecting the Greek Article, 277 sq.—reasons why these remarks are so named, 277—want of a satisfactory definition of the Greek article, 279 sq.—nature of the Greek article, 288 sq.—is it an essential part of speech? 293 sq.—early usage of Greek writers, 293 sq.—principles respecting the article, 297 sq.—modifications and exceptions, 305 sq.—illustration by other parts of speech, 306 sq.—cases where the meaning is changed by the admission or exclusion of the article, 318—cases of arbitrary use, 319 sq.—important conclusions, built on the absence or presence of the article, in respect to some doctrines of theology, 321 sq.

Hodegetics, explanation of the term, 127.

Homiletics, 133.

Horses, see *Bedouins*.

Hospitality, see *Bedouins*.

Huss John, receives *Wicliffe's* writings, 431—sketch of his life, 432 sq.—his merits in respect to the Bohemian language, 434—summoned before the council of Constance, 435—his death, 437—its consequences, 438 sq.—writings of Huss, 436.

I.

Indian origin of the name Jehovah, 89, 105 sq.—whether found among the American Indians, 103, 104.

Inspiration, doctrines of the Alexandrian school on, 190 sq.

Interpretation of the New Testa-

ment, 171—necessity of the study of the Jewish history, 172—of the geography of Palestine and the adjacent territories, 173 sq.—of the customs of the Jews, 175—and of the Hebrew language, 175—178.

Iona, monastery at, 552.

Irenics, 131.

Isagoge, explanation of the term, 127.

Isis, inscription on her temple, 98 sq.

J.

James, alleged discrepancy between him and Paul, 683 sq.—De Wette's view on it, 684 sq.—investigation of the passages in question, 684 sq.—whether the discrepancy is *real* or *apparent*, 688 sq.—methods of conciliation, 694 sq.—object of James, 702 sq.—unity of faith and works, 704.

Jehovah, hypothesis of the Egyptian or Indian origin of the name, 89 sq.—Schiller's Mission of Moses, 90.—Reinhold's views of the Hebrew mysteries, 91 sq.—disputes of the theologians as to their connexion with Egypt, 93 sq.—whether the Tetragrammaton is to be found among the Chinese, 97—farther examination of the data by which the hypothesis is maintained, 98 sq.—resemblance of the names Jehovah and Jovis, 104 sq.—whether the origin of the name Jehovah is to be sought in Eastern Asia, 105 sq.—principle which ought to be followed in the comparison of Hebrew with foreign words, 107—deep meaning of the names applied to God, 108.

Jerome of Prague, his erudition and zeal, 434, 435—his death, 437—magnanimity and eloquence, 437.

Jewish Scribe and MSS. 766 sq.

Josephus, his testimony respecting Christ, 705 sq.—grounds for its genuineness, 706 sq.

K.

Karaïtes, 662, 665, 770—description of the fortress *Djufut Kale*, 666 sq. 770—Rabbi Benjamin, 667 sq.—burying ground of the Karaïtes, 669, 670—their earlier history and language, 670 sq.—doctrines, 673 sq.—mode of worship, 669 sq.—Tartar version of the Old Testament, 681 sq.

Karamsin, his history of Russia and general influence on the Russian language, 382, 383.

L.

Lament of David; introduction, 594 sq.—Lament, 598 sq.—translation, 600—commentary, 601 sq.

Lexicography of the New Testament, see *Philology*.—Greek and English Lexicography, 556 sq.—Schneider's Lexicon, 560 sq.—Passow's Lexicon, 564 sq.—Paris edition of Stephen's Thesaurus, 567 sq.—Donnegan's Lexicon, 577 sq.—general rules of lexicography, 588 sq.—Greek and English Lexicon of the N. T. 771.

Literary Notices, 413 sq. 606 sq. 613 sq. 766 sq.

Liturgics, 133.

Locusts, see *Bedouins*.

Lomonosof, sketch of his life, 373—his Russian Grammar and general influence on the Russian language, 373, 374.

M.

- Macarius*, 58.
Manuscripts of Moscow collated by Matthaei, 367—modern Hebrew manuscripts, 766 sq.
Methodius, Cyril's assistant in the translation of the Scriptures, 349—his merits in respect to the conversion and instruction of the Slavi, 350 sq.
Methodology, theological, outlines of, 134 sq.
Mongols, under Gengis Khan and at present, 364—researches on their country, history and language, in Russia, 385, 386.
Morus on the difference between the sense and the signification of words and phrases, 61 sq.

N.

- Nazarene*, 182 sq. see *Nazareth*.
Nazareth, inquiry respecting the name of this city, 182 sq.—whether the residence of Christ in Nazareth served for the fulfilment of the prophecies, 186 sq.—remarks upon the citation in Matthew, 187 sq.
Neander's History of the Planting and Progress of the Christian Church, etc. extracts from it, on Paul as the Apostle of the Heathen, 138 sq.—on the primitive church, 241 sq.—second volume announced, 416.—translating in England, 775—Letter from Neander, 776.
Nestor, the first Slavic historian, 355, 364, 367.

O.

- Obotrites*, 523 sq.
Officers of the church, see *Christian Church*.
Old Slavic language, 345 sq.—pe-

- riods of its developement, 353 sq.—philological works, 357 sq.
Olshausen's edition of the Zend Avesta, 606 sq.
Oriental Languages, study of them in Russia, 378 sq. 386—Lectures delivered in Paris, 415.
Origen, 33—sketch of his life, 34 sq.—his moral excellence, 44, 47 sq.—tendency of his writings, 45 sq.—his great productiveness 46—his views on inspiration, 191—on omnipotence, 193—on creation, 196 sq.—on divine providence, 201 sq.—on the trinity, 213 sq.—on the nature of man and free will, 625 sq.—on depravity and original sin, 628 sq.—on the future state of man, 633 sq.

P.

- Paedagogics*, 129.
Pantaenus, 27.
Passover, time of our Lord's last, 108 sq.—whether it is possible to harmonize the accounts of the evangelists, 109 sq.—examination of them, 110 sq.—principles according to which they are to be understood and estimated, 110 sq.—unfounded hypotheses started in respect to this subject, 123—agreement of the present explanation with the ancient tradition, still surviving in the christian churches, 124 sq.—appeal of Polycarp, 125.
Passow's Greek Lexicon, its merits, 564—biographical notice, 567.
Pastoral Theology, 133. See *Theology*.
Paul as the Apostle of the heathen, 138—his birth and education, 139 sq.—whether a natural explanation of the fact

- which caused his conversion is admissible, 142 sq.—farther events of his life, 147 sq.—influence of the pharisaic doctrines upon Christianity and at what time the independence of the gospel upon the Mosaic law was first recognized, 151 sq.—his views of the relation of christian teachers to the church, 258 sq.—of the attempts made to mingle Judaism and Christianity together, 266 sq.—in respect to baptism, 372, 373—apparent discrepancy between him and James, see *James*.
- Pearce*, Rev. W. H. Letter from, 775.
- Peter Martyr*, 55—his views on the trinity, 237—his discourse on the soul, 638.
- Peter the Great's* merits and demerits in respect to the Russian language, 368 sq.
- Pierius*, 54—his views on the pre-existence of souls, 637.
- Philology*, an acquaintance with it requisite to theological students, 128—Philology and Lexicography of the New Testament, 154 sq.—study of sacred literature, 155—of the original scriptures, 157 sq.—character of the language, 159 sq.—chief sources, 166 sq.—illustrations from Greek poetry for the understanding of the New Testament, 170—necessary limits, 171—the New Testament cannot fully be understood without a knowledge of the Hebrew language, 175 sq.—why we should employ German manuals, 180 sq.
- Philosophy*, German, 610 sq. :
- Polemics*, 131.
- Poles*, signification and origin of the name, 472.
- Polish* language and literature; earliest history of the Poles, 471 sq.—extent and character of the language, 474 sq.—first period of its developement, 477 sq.—second period, 479 sq.—third period, 481 sq.—fourth period, 492 sq.—fifth period, 497 sq.—literary and philological works, 521, 522.
- Propaedeutics*, explanation of the word, 127.
- Providence*, doctrines of the Alexandrian school, 200—204.

R.

Rauch on the time of our Lord's last Passover, 108 sq.

Rhodo, 60.

Russian Language and Literature, 358 sq.—dialects, 360—character of the language, 361 sq.—first period of its literature, 362 sq.—second period, 368 sq.—third period, 372 sq.—fourth period, 377 sq.—Russian literary and philological works, 377, 388 sq.

Russians, signification and origin of the name, 138.

S.

Schaffarik, author of the History of the Slavic Language and Literature, 471—a larger work to be expected from him, 531—extract of one of his letters, 532.

Schneider's Greek Lexicon, its merits, 560.

Sense and Signification of words and phrases, 61 sq.—course which a translator has to pursue in cases where a literal interpretation is impracticable, 63

- sq.—the same principles, applied to the mere explanation of a writer, 65 sq.—abuse of this rule, 73 sq.—cases where the fixing of the meaning is left to the discrimination of the interpreter, 75 sq.—duty of the translator in this respect, 78.
- Scrapion*, 55.
- Servian Language and Literature*, 389 sq.—Servians of the Oriental church, 393 sq.—Bulgarians, 400 sq.—Dalmatians, 401 sq.—Glagolitic literature, 401 sq.—Secular literature, 403 sq.—Catholic Slavonians, 406—Dalmatian philological works, 406.
- Servians*, signification and origin of the name, 389.
- Shemilish* languages, importance to the theological student, 137.
- Signification*, difference between the sense and the signification of words, 61. See *Sense*.
- Slavi*, signification and origin of the name, 330.
- Slavic Languages and Literature*, historical view of 328 sq.—earliest history, 329—geographical boundaries, 331—mythology, 331 sq.—general divisions, 334 sq.—general characteristics of the Slavic languages, 337 sq.—Old or Church Slavic, 345 sq.—Russian Language and Literature, 358 sq.—Servian Language and Literature, 389 sq.—Language of the Croatsians, 407 sq.—of the Slovenzi, 409 sq.—Bohemian Language and Literature, 417 sq.—Language of the Slovaks, 464 sq.—Language and Literature of the Poles, 471 sq.—of the Sorabian Vendes, 522 sq.
- Slavonic*, see *Old Slavic*.
- Slovaks*, as a nation, 336—their language and literature, 464 sq.
- Slovenzi* as a nation, 336—their language and literature, 400 sq.
- Sopher*, or Hebrew scribe, Henderson's visit to one, 767 sq.
- Sorabae*, 526.
- Stephen's Thesaurus*, Paris edition, its merits, 567.
- Suidas' Greek Lexicon*, 414, 774.
- Symbolics*, 131.
- T.
- Tartar Version of the Old Testament*, 681.
- Tchekhes*, see *Bohemians*.
- Tetragrammaton of the Chinese*, 97.
- Theognostus*, 55—his views on the trinity, 237.
- Theological Education*, importance of, 1—necessity of a christian education of the clergy, 3 sq.—advantages of a knowledge of the history of theological education, 8, 9, 662.
- Theological Literature of the Slavic languages*. Old Slavic, 351 sq. 364, 371, 376, 377, 387—writings of the Servian monks, 394 sq.—Glagolitic literature, 401 sq.—effects of the Reformation among the Croatsians, 407—and the Vindes, 409 sq.—theological literature of the Bohemians, 427, 430 sq. 440 sq. 450 sq. 455 sq.—of the Poles, 483, 490, 494—of the Vendes of Lusatia, 530 sq.
- Theological Study*, outlines of the course at Leipzig, 126 sq.—importance of a proper choice and a good beginning, 127—necessary preparation, 128.
- Theology*, theoretical theology, 129—exegetical, 180—system-

matic, 130—historical, 131—practical, 133, 137—a necessary study for the right interpretation of the New Testament, 175 sq.—views of the Alexandrian school, 191 sq.

Theophilus of Antioch, the first who used the term trinity, 207.

Trinity, doctrines of the Alexandrian school, 204 sq.—first use of the term, 207.

V.

Vendish tribes, history of the, 522 sq.—Obotrites, 523 sq.—Pomeranians, 525—Ukrians, 525 sq.—Sorabae, 526 sq.—their lan-

guage in Upper Lusatia, 529 sq.—in Lower Lusatia, 531.

Vindes, see *Slovenzi*.

Voltaire, anecdote of, 92.

W.

Wedding, Jewish, 770.

Western Stem of the Slavic nations, 333, 336, 417 sq.

Z.

Zend Language and *Zend-Avesta*, 606 sq.—recent works, affording aid for the illustration of the Zend text, 609.—compared with the Sanscrit, 611.

Zoharites, a Jewish sect, 664.

9



